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## CHAP. I.

In the Introduction, pp. 276-370, I have already given a complete paraphrase of the contents of this book, exhibiting the main divisions and general principles of arrangement and the connexion of its several parts: and have added, in five appendices, dissertations on some special points which seemed to require a more detailed treatment than they could conveniently receive in mere notes. Referring to this for information on all such general matters, I may confine myself in the commentary to special details of language, allusion, and such like particulars. This book, by the extreme brevity of expression which characterises it, leaving even more than usual to the reader's ingenuity to supply, by the consequent difficulty of translation, and the obscurity of many of the allusions, offers at least as many impediments and stumblingblocks to the embarrassed commentator as either of the two preceding; and it is to be feared that the explanation and illustration are not likely to be much shorter than before, in spite of what has been already done in the Introduction.

With the end of Book II we finish the treatment of what (according to the Latin division) is termed inventio, the invention and supply of all the various kinds of arguments, which the orator has to invent, or find for himself; and we now proceed to the analysis of (1) $\lambda \epsilon \xi$ ts, elocutio, verbal style, including ínóxpuoıs, delivery, pronuntiatio and actio, (Aristotle omits the latter, at all events in the treatment of it, confining vinóxpıots to the mode of speaking, declamation, § 4): and (2) rákts, the order and disposition, together with the ordinary topics, of the several divisions of the speech. The first is examined in the first twelve chapters, the second from the thirteenth to the end. These three general divisions of the art are expressed by Cicero, Orator § 43, tria videnda sunt oratori, quid dicat ( $\pi$ íareıs), quo quidque loco ( $\tau$ á $\xi \mathrm{s}$ ), et quomodo ( $\lambda$ ésıs).
§ I commences with a partial repetition of the concluding summary of the preceding chapter. The three modes of proof are enumerated,
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#### Abstract

the embarrassed commentator as either of the two preceding; and it is to be feared that the explanation and illustration are not likely to be much shorter than before, in spite of what has been already done in the Introduction.

With the end of Book II we finish the treatment of what (according to the Latin division) is termed inventio, the invention and supply of all the various kinds of arguments, which the orator has to invent, or find for himself; and we now proceed to the analysis of (i) $\lambda \in \mathfrak{\xi} t s$, elocutio, verbal style, including vimóкрєбts, delivery, pronuntiatio and actio, (Aristotle omits the latter, at all events in the treatment of it, confining  order and disposition, together with the ordinary topics, of the several divisions of the speech. The first is examined in the first twelve chapters, the second from the thirteenth to the end. These three general divisions of the art are expressed by Cicero, Orator § 43, tria videnda sunt oratori, quid dicat ( $\pi$ írrets), quo quidque loco ( $\tau$ ásıs), et quomodo ( $\lambda$ ég $\iota s$ ). § I commences with a partial repetition of the concluding summary of the preceding chapter. The three modes of proof are enumerated, $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{i \sigma r e t s}, \dot{\eta}$ Oos, $\pi \dot{\text { áOos }}$ : (1) the direct logical proof, by argument ; (2) the con-


# APIETOTEAOYE 

## TEXNH PH TOPIKHE $\Gamma$.


 P. $1403^{6}$

CHAP. I.

In the Introduction, pp. 276-370, I have already given a complete paraphrase of the contents of this book, exhibiting the main divisions and general principles of arrangement and the connexion of its several parts: and have added, in five appendices, dissertations on some special quarto edition 183 I . p. 110 points which seemed to require a more detailed treatment than they could conveniently receive in mere notes. Referring to this for informa-- tion on all such general matters, I may confine myself in the commentary to special details of language, allusion, and such like particulars. This book, by the extreme brevity of expression which characterises it, leaving even more than usual to the reader's ingenuity to supply, by the consequent difficulty of translation, and the obscurity of many of the allusions, offers at least as many impediments and stumblingblocks to the embarrassed commentator as either of the two preceding; and it is to be feared that the explanation and illustration are not likely to be much shorter than before, in spite of what has been already done in the Introduction.

With the end of Book II we finish the treatment of what (according to the Latin division) is termed inventio, the invention and supply of all the various kinds of arguments, which the orator has to invent, or find for himself; and we now proceed to the analysis of ( 1 ) $\lambda \in \mathfrak{\xi} / \mathrm{s}$,
 (Aristotle omits the latter, at all events in the treatment of it, confining úmókpırıs to the mode of speaking, declamation, § 4): and (2) rágıs, the order and disposition, together with the ordinary topics, of the several divisions of the speech. The first is examined in the first twelve chapters, the second from the thirteenth to the end. These three general divisions of the art are expressed by Cicero, Orator § 43, tria videnda sunt oratori, quid dicat (riortcts), quo quidque loco (rákıs), et quomodo ( $\lambda$ és $\iota s$ ).
§ I commences with a partial repetition of the concluding summary of the preceding chapter. The three modes of proof are enumerated, $\pi i \sigma r e t s, \dot{\eta} \theta o s, \pi \dot{a} \theta o s:$ : ( 1 ) the direct logical proof, by argument ; (2) the con-













veying a favourable impression by the exhibition of character in and by the speech; and (3), working on the feelings of the audience, so as to bring them to that state of mind which is favourable to the orator's purpose; to excite an angry or a calm temper, love or hatred, envy, jealousy, righteous indignation, and so on, according to circumstances and the immediate occasion.
'The enthymemes too have been stated, whence they are to be supplied; for of enthymemes there are special ( $\epsilon i \delta \eta$ ) as well as common topics (тózot)'. See the quotation from Spengel's Study of Ancient Rhetoric prefixed to II 23.
§ 2. 'The next subject to be treated of is style' (the manner of expressing oneself; including not only the language, but the manner of delivery; both in voice, declamation, the pronunciation, tone, rhythm, \&c.; and-here Aristotle stops, and the Latin rhetoricians add-action, the appropriate gesticulation, management of the hands and the body in general, and expecially the features): 'for it is not sufficient to know what to say, it is necessary also to know how to say it; and this contributes greatly to the impression conveyed of a certain character in the speech'. The tone of voice, the expression of the features, the gestures employed, the kind of language used, quite independently of the arguments, will materially assist the impression of moral (or any particular) character which the orator wishes to assume, on the minds of the audience. The $\bar{\eta}$ Oos of III 16.8 is part of this, the moral character imparted by the choice of language, of terms, tone and expression, significant of moral purpose, inoaipeots.
§ 3. 'Now first of all, inquiry was naturally directed to that which is first in the natural order, the sources from which things themselves derive their plausibility or power of persuasion' (i.e. what are the sources of rhetorical proof of facts themselves; which of course is the basis of the entire art or practice, and therefore 'first in the order of nature'); ' and secondly, the due setting out (disposal) of these by the language;




and thirdly（ $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{u} \mathbf{v}^{2} \omega \nu$ ，of such things as these，the divisions of Rhetoric）， what has the greatest force（or influence，is especially effective as a means of persuasion），but has not yet been attempted（regularly，systematically， as an art，no serious attempt has yet been made upon it），that which relates to delivery＇．


 Victorius．
$\delta_{\iota a}$＇́ $\sigma \theta a t$ ］denotes the＇disposal＇or＇disposition＇，i．e．the investing of the speech with a certain character，putting it in a certain state，by the use of language：as the dxpoarai of a speech are said $\delta \dot{\delta} \boldsymbol{i} i \theta \in \sigma \theta a i \pi \omega s$ ，to be brought into such and such a disposition or state of feeling by it：a common use of the verb．It does not mean here distribution，ordering， arrangement，which is not the special office of the graces and proprieties of language or style．There is another sense in which this verb is used by later writers，as Polybius，Dionysius，Diodorus，with $\lambda^{\prime}$ yovs and the like，disponere，in publicum proponere，in medium proferre，to dispose or set out（8tá），as wares in a market for sale，étaler；which may possibly be the meaning here，though，I think，it would be less appropriate．Victo－ rius renders it explanare．8tá $\theta \in \sigma t s$ ，in Longinus quoted below，seems to correspond to $8 x a r i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ here in the sense in which I have explained it．
 passive，which I have explained and illustrated in Appendix B on I 12.22 ［Vol．I．p．297］．

ข่ло́крьбเs，＇acting＇，properly includes，besides declamation，the ma－ nagement of the voice，to which Aristotle，as already mentioned，here confines it，§4，that of the features，arms，hands，and the entire body：and so it is treated by the Latin rhetoricians，Cicero，Quintilian，\＆c．Longi－ nus，Ars Rhet．，（apud Spengel，Rhet．Gr．I 310，）has a chapter upon it，


 cis пiбтıע к．т．入．Dionysius，de admirabili vi dicendi in Demosthene，c．22， p． 1023 （Reiske），says of the great orator，кобرойvтаs äта⿱亠䒑a каì хр $\eta \mu a r i-$

 See Quint．XI 3．5，on the effect of pronuntiatio，＇delivery，declamation＇， where he says that even an indifferent speech set off by the vigour and grace of action will have more weight or effect than the very best without it：in $\S 6$ he quotes the opinion of Demosthenes，who assigned successively the first，second，and third place to declamation（pronuntiatio），and so on till his questioner stopped．In § 7 he quotes Aeschines＇saying to the


Rhodians, who were admiring the de Corona as he recited it to them, Quid si ipsum audissetis? et M. Cicero unam in dicendo actionem dominari putat. Cic. de Or. III 56. 213, from which the whole passage of Quintilian is taken. Also Brutus, LXVI 234, Lentulus' opinion. XXXVIII 141, 142. XliII 168 (Spalding ad loc. Quint.). On Demosthenes' dictum, Bacon, Essays, Of Boldnesse, init., has this remark: A strange thing that that part of an Oratour which is but superficiall, and rather the vertue of a Player, should be placed so high above those other noble parts of Invention, Elocution, and the rest ; nay almost alone, as if it were all in all. But the reason is plaine. There is in humane Nature generally more of the foole then of the wise; and therefore those faculties by which the foolish part of men's mindes is taken are most potent.
'(And this is not at all surprising) because in fact it was not till late that it made its way into the tragic art and rhapsody; for the poets at first (in the earliest stages of the drama) used to act their tragedies themselves' (and therefore, as there was no profession of acting or professional actors, it was not likely that an art of acting should be constructed; the poets acted, as they wrote, as well as they could by the light of nature, without any rules of art).
 Müller, Hist. Gr. Lit. c. 4 § 3. Heyne, Excursus II ad Il. 』, § 3; Vol. viII. p. 792. F. A. Wolf, Proleg. ad Hom., p. 99 seq. Nitzsch, Quaest. Hom. Iv. p. 13 seq.



 -idem scilcet, id quod omnes tum erant, suorum carminum actor. Victorius thinks that this statement is confirmed by Hor. A. P. 277, quae canerent agerentque peruncti faecibus ora, which means that 'the poets themselves had their faces smeared'. Donaldson, Theatre of the Greeks, Ed. vii. p. 59, n. 10.
'It is plain then that there is something of this kind in Rhetoric also as well as in poetry' (declamation may be studied and practised for the purposes of Rhetoric, as well as for those of acting in tragedy and comedy or of rhapsodical recitation): 'which, in fact, (i. e. the 'poetical' declamation), has been dealt with (treated artistically, see note on I I. 3), besides others, by Glaucon of Teos in particular'.
 $\pi \quad \pi \eta \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta} \nu$, is not unfrequent in Aristotle. Compare Pol. I 2, 1252 26,



Glaucon of Teos, an Ionian city on the coast of Asia Minor, is most probably the same as a Glaucon mentioned by Ion, Plat. Ion 530 D (so Stallbaum's note ad loc.), as following his own profession as a rhapsodist, which seems suitable enough for one who writes on the art of tragic declamation, especially as acting and rhapsodizing are actually coupled







 1 aüтท
together by Aristotle in the preceding sentence. I should be disposed also to identify with him of Teos, the Glaucon quoted in Poet. xxv 23 -seemingly as a poetical critic, which is also a kindred pursuit. See in Smith's Biogr. Dict. the third article on Glaucon.

Tyrrwhitt ad loc. Poet. seems in favour of the supposition that the three Glaucons are one. A Glaucon who wrote a work on $\gamma \boldsymbol{\lambda} \omega \bar{\sigma} \sigma a t$ (sic), Athen. XI 480 F , was at all events not far removed from the same studies. Schneider, ad Xen. Conv. inl 6.
§ 4. ढ̈бrt $\delta$ ' avití] So all mSS and Edd., except Buhle, who reads $a v i \tau \eta$. This surely must be right: avití seems to have no meaning here. Victorius retaining av̀rý translates 'haec'.
'This (declamation, inóxpıбts) resides in the voice, in the mode of employing it, that is, for (the expression of) any emotion; that is to say, sometimes loud, sometimes low, sometimes intermediate (between the two, middling, neither the one nor the other); and in the mode of employing the accents (or tones of voice), that is to say acute, grave, middle' (circumflex, from the combination of the two others, $\Lambda=\sim$ ), 'and certain measures (times) in respect of each. For there are three things that are the subjects of such enquiries, magnitude (intensity, volume of sound), tune, time'.
oiov] is here in both cases videlicet, 'that is to say', a direct specification of certain definite things; not, as usual, 'for instance', as an example or specimen, which supposes other things of the same kind, besides those expressly mentioned. Thus oiov here does not mean that the three kinds of sounds and accents mentioned are mere examples of a much larger class, but they specify the exact number of kinds which are intended to be distinguished in either case. This is common in Aristotle. Instances are, few out of many, Pol. I 6, sub fin., סoû入os $\mu$ épos $\tau t$

入óyov ëXovtos кaì tov̂ ả̉óyov. II 5, 1264 a 26, oitov фpoúpovs. Ib. c. 6, 1265 a 35, oiov, 'I mean to say.' De Sens. c. 5, 443 a 10, rà oroıxeía,


On the modulation of the voice in the expression of the various emotions, see Cic. de Or. III. cc. 57, 58, §§215-219, where it is illustrated at length.

On the accents, and $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \in \theta o s, \dot{a} \rho \mu \nu_{i} i_{a}, \dot{\rho} v \theta \mu o ́ s$, and their application to Rhetoric, see Introduction, Appendix C to Book III, p. 379 seq.






' Now one might almost say (it is pretty nearly true to say) that these are the men that gain all the prizes in (lit. out of, as the produce or profit derived from, got out of them,) the contests (dramatic and rhapsodical), and as in these the actors have more power, influence, effect (over the audiences, and those who adjudge the prizes), than the poets nowadays, so likewise (has acting or declamation) in civil and social contests (the contests of the law-courts, and public assembly-comp. III 12.2) by reason of the defects (the vicious, depraved character) of our constitutions' (as that of Athens, where I, Aristotle, am now writing).

The vice or defect, which permits these irregular and extraneous, appeals to the feelings, and the influence which 'acting' thereby acquires, are attributed here to the constitution-comp. I I.4, where 'well-governed
 tutions, are said to forbid them: if that of Athens were sound and healthy and right, ivin's, oj $\rho \theta \dot{\eta}$, opposed to $\mu$ ox $\theta \eta \rho a \dot{a}$, they would not be allowed there. In the next section, 5, the defect is attributed to the audience: in the one case the institutions themselves are in fault, in the other the tempers and disposition of the hearers, whose taste and judgment are so depraved that they require the stimulus of these distorting (8ıабтр́́фоута, I I. 5) emotions.

On the influence of acting in producing emotion, and thereby persuasion, see by all means Cicero's description, de Or. III 56 § 213, seq., which furnishes an excellent illustration of what is here said. Note particularly the case of Gracchus, § 214. After a quotation from his speech Cicero adds, quae sic ab illo csse acta constabat oculis voce gestu, inimici ut lacrimas tenere non possent. And Orat. c. XVII, est enim actio quasi corporis quaedam eloquentia, quum constet e voce et motu, § 55 and the rest.
§ 5. 'But no art has been as yet composed of it; for in fact it was not till late that that of composition made any advance: and it ( $\dot{\eta}$ $\boldsymbol{v} \pi$ окрıтıк $\eta^{\prime}$ ) is thought low and vulgar' (in the sense of popular and unsubstantial, directed to show, not substance) 'and rightly so considered' (or, 'when considered aright'; so Victorius. But the other is the more natural interpretation of $\dot{u \pi} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\lambda} a \mu \beta a ́ v \epsilon \iota \nu$; which will not in fact bear the meaning assigned to it by Victorius 'Si vere iudicare volumus': 'consider' in the two renderings has different senses).

фортıkós, see note on II 21. 15, opposed to xapteís in the sense of mental refinement and cultivation, Molestos et illepidos, quos Graeci $\mu_{0}$ XOךpoùs кaì фoprıкois dicerent; Aulus Gellius, Noctes Attici 18.4






 (Gaisford). See Twining on Poet. note 263, pp. 540-544, where a number of examples illustrative of its various applications are collected.
 lents helps to explain a distinction in Eth. Eudem. I 4.2, of arts фop-
 (mechanical), which is subsequently explained, $\lambda$ ézw $\delta \dot{\text { è }}$ фoprıкàs $\mu e ̀ \nu$ ràs $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \delta o ́ \xi a \nu ~ \pi \rho a \gamma \mu a r є v o \mu e ́ v a s ~ \mu o ́ v o v . ~ T h i s ~ I ~ s u p p o s e ~ m u s t ~ b e ~ m e a n t ~ o f ~ a r t s ~$ that have nothing solid and substantial about them, but aim at mere outside show, ostentatious and hollow, $\pi \rho \dot{o} s{ }^{2} o ́ \xi a \nu$ contrasted with $\pi \rho o ̀ s$
 And this same signification is plainly conveyed by the word here in the
 $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{s} \pi \rho a \gamma \mu a \tau \epsilon i a s$, i. e. not only $\boldsymbol{v} \pi \pi к р \iota \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$, but the whole of Rhetoric, is directed $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \delta o ̊ \xi a v$. So that фортькóv here must stand, as it often does, for the vulgarity which is shewn in unphilosophical habits of mind, want of mental cultivation in persons: and, as applied to a study or art, may signify popular, showy, unsubstantial, and in this point of view too low and vulgar to be entertained by a man of science or philosopher. It has precisely the same meaning in Pol. 1 11, 1258 b35. See Eaton ad loc.
' But since the entire study and business of Rhetoric is directed to mere opinion, is unscientific, (directed to rò סoкeiv, mere outward show, not rò civat: $17.36-37$, see note, ) we must bestow the requisite ( $\tau \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu$ ) pains and attention upon it, not that it is right (to do so), but as necessary (for success in persuading): for, as to strict justice, that implies, (requires, subaudi ėori,) looking for no more in the delivery of the speech than (to speak it) in a manner which will give neither offence nor delight: for fairness requires that the case be fought on the facts alone, and therefore everything else outside the direct proof (of them) is superfluous: but still, as has been already said, they have vast influence by reason of the vice or defects (depraved taste and judgment) of the hearer'. Quint. II 17.27 seq. Imperiti enim iudicant, et qui frequenter in hoc ipsum fallendi sunt, ne errent. Nam si mihi sapientes iudices dentur, sapientum conciones; atque omne concilium, nihil invidia valeat, nihil gratia, nihil opinio praesumpta falsique testes: perquam sit exigrus eloquentiae locus, et prope in sola delectatione ponatur. Sin et audientium mobiles animi et tot malis obnoxia veritas, arte pugnandum est et adhibenda quae prosunt. $\$ \$ 28,29$.








§6. 'Now (attention to) style (mode of speaking) is nevertheless in some slight degree necessary (has some slight portion of necessity) in every kind (department) of instruction: for it makes some difference in the clearness of an explanation whether we speak in one way or another; not however so much (as is generally supposed), but all this is mere fancy ( ${ }^{( }$avrafia 'the mental presentation, a mere copy, without reality, note on I II. 6), and addressed to (for the sake of, to gratify) the hearer: for no one teaches geometry in this way'. These tricks and graces of style, declamation and acting, have no power of instruction, and therefore are never addressed to any student; but only to a popular audience like that of the orator, which requires to be flattered or have its ears tickled (as Plato says in the Gorgias [463 C, кo入aкeias rópov rìp
 ciliated, as well as instructed and convinced,
§ 7. 'Now that (the art which applies inoкpırкí to Rhetoric), whenever it reaches us (arrives), will produce the same effects as the art of acting (i. e. the application of it to dramatic poetry, § 3) : some indeed have already to a trifing extent made the attempt to treat of it, as Thrasymachus in his $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{f} \boldsymbol{\prime}$; in fact, a capacity for acting is a natural gift' (part of that general love of imitation which is the foundation of all the imitative or fine arts, Poet. c. I) 'and less subject to rules of art' (more, or
 of tragedy in its earliest stage), 'but when applied to language (declamation) it (the practice of it) may be reduced to an art. And therefore

 explanation, Victorius), 'as do also rhetoricians in respect of (by) their acting or declamation: for written speeches (in the imideuktuò yévos) owe more of their effect to the style and language than to the thought or intellectual part'; diávocav (Rhet, II 26.5, Poet. xix 2) meaning here the logical part of Rhetoric, the direct and indirect arguments.

Thrasymachus and his tieac are described by Plato, Phaedr. 267 c,





On Thrasymachus see Cambridge fournal of Classical and Sacred
 Scriptores [pp. 95-97, and Blass, die Attische Beredsamkeit, I esp. p. 244, also K. F. Hermann's Disputatio de Thrasymacho Chalccdonio sophista,







 $\phi \cup к \epsilon \nu$, oí $\pi о \iota \eta \tau \alpha i ́ \cdot \tau \alpha \dot{\gamma \alpha ̀} \rho$ óvó $\mu \alpha \tau \alpha \mu \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ є̀ $\sigma \tau i \nu$,
Gottingen, 1848, pp. 15, and Mayor's note on Juv. VII 204, paenituit multos vanae sterilisque cathedrae, sicut Tharsymachi probat exitus. Quint. III 3.4, Nec audiendi quidam...qui tres modo primas esse partes volunt, quoniam memoria atque actio natura non arte contingant,...licet Thrasymachus quoque idem de actione crediderit (sc. àтєұvórєpò civat), where Quintilian must be referring to the present passage, though he is misled by the words oiov Өpacórıaxos èv tois ènéoss, into supposing that
 quotation from Thrasymachus.]
 крırĝ $\kappa . \tau . \lambda$. at the end of the section.
§ 8. 'Now the origin of this was due, as is natural, to the poets: for not only are all names imitations (copies of things, which they are supposed to represent), but there was also the voice ready for use, the most imitative of all our members; and so it was (in virtue of the same imitative faculty, Victorius) that the arts were composed, that of rhapsodizing and of acting and of course ( $\gamma \epsilon$, to be sure) others'.
kıveiv, in the sense of origirating anything, 'to stir, set in motion',
 трауч8ià кıעєì ${ }^{1}$ (Victorius). Sext. Empir., adv. Math. vil 6, quotes Aristotle as having said that Empedocles $\pi \rho \omega \hat{\text { ® }}$ Quintilian, III I. 8, doubtless also with reference to Aristotle, repeats this, primus post eos...movisse aliqua circa rhetoricen Empedocles dicitur.
 Socrates' 'origination' of the study of Moral Philosophy, ó т тюఱ̂тоs aùrخ̀े \&ógas keкıขךкéval. See Spalding ad loc. Quint., who quotes Athen. XIv
 Quint. III 6. IO, 103, IV I. 29.
$\dot{o}_{\boldsymbol{\nu} \text { о́ } \mu а т а ~}^{\mu \mu \mu \dot{\jmath} \mu а т а] ~ T h i s ~ i s ~ t h e ~ P l a t o n i c ~ t h e o r y, ~ C r a t y l . ~} 423$ A seq.

[^0]



 ad Philebum Platonis tradit Democritum nomina vocales imagines rerum
 $\Delta \eta \mu$ о́крıтоs." Victorius. Aristotle himself, de Interpretatione, sub init. 16a3,
 ó $\mu \circ \omega \dot{\mu} \mu a r a$, signs or representatives, and copies, of mental affections, i. e. impressions, a theory quite different from that of Plato, which is here adopted. On the terms applied by Aristotle to express the nature of words, see Waitz, on Organon $16 a 4$. Of the four employed, he says, $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \beta o \lambda o \nu$ is a subjective $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i o v$, and $\dot{\delta} \mu o i \omega \mu a$ an objective $\mu i \mu \eta \mu a$. On imitation and the natural love of it, the origin and foundation of all the fine arts, see the first three chapters of the Poetics. In c. 4, init. imitation or mimicry is described as natural to man from infancy, and characteristic of humanity. [Dionysius Halic. de comp. verb. p. 94 (quoted in Farrar's

 $\pi \rho \dot{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\mu} \mu \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\alpha}$.]
 ing been the first who devoted themselves to the study of style or language, in this sense. Words being the copies of things, the poets, whose object is imitation, addicted themselves to the study of them, in order to be able better to represent the things of which they were images. Victorius.
ai ríxval ovvévtŋaav] Some of the writers on rhapsodizing, with which was naturally combined the criticism of Homer, are mentioned in Plat. Ion. 530 C, Metrodorus of Lampsacus, Stesimbrotus of Thasos (Xenoph. Conv. III 6), and Glaucon, probably of Teos, mentioned above, § 3.
§ 9. 'And as the reputation which the poets acquired in spite of the simplicity of what they said (the silliness of the thoughts expressed) was thought (by those who imitated them) to be due to their language, it was for this reason that the language (of prose) first took a poetical colour, as that of Gorgias. And still, even at this day, the mass of the uneducated think the discourses of speakers of this kind mighty fine. Such however is not the fact, but the language of prose and poetry is distinct'.

To the same effect Dionysius, de Lys. Iud. c. 3, (v. 457, Reiske). Lysias' predecessors were not of his opinion about style-his was the $\dot{a} \phi \in \lambda$ ìs




 $i \delta \iota \dot{\sigma} \tau \eta$, к.т. . This was the new style introduced by Gorgias and his followers Polus and Licymnius (Alcidamas, \&c.). Hermogenes, $\pi \in \rho \stackrel{\imath}{l}$


 $\tau \omega \bar{\nu} \alpha \pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon \dot{\prime} \tau \omega \nu$ тoùs toloútovs oỉovтaı $\delta \iota \alpha \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$







 of Gorgias，Quum enim videret oratores cum severitate audiri poetas autem cum voluptate，tum dicitur numeros secutus quibus etiam in ora－ tione uteremur，quum iucunditatis causa tum ut varietas occurreret satietati．So Theophrastus，Dion．Lys．Iud．c．14，condemns this af－ fected poetical language of the Sicilian school of rhetoricians as childish，



On Gorgias＇novel and poetical style and the figures that he intro－ duced into Rhetoric，see Camb．Fourn．of Classical and Sacred Philology， No．viI Vol．III pp．66－7，73－5，and on the rhetorical figures，which are classified，69－72．Comp．Cic．Orat．§ 175 ［paria paribus adiuncta et similiter definita itemque contrariis relata contraria，quae sua sponte， etiamsi id non agas，cadunt plerumque numerose，Gorgias primus invenit， sed eis est usus intemperantius．See also Blass，die Attische Beredsamkeit， 1 esp．pp．57－64．As a specimen of the poetical style of Gorgias we have his metaphorical term for vultures，$\epsilon_{\epsilon} \mu \psi v \chi_{0}$ rádot，parallels to which may be found in the poets Lucretius and Spenser，Lucr．v 924，viva videns vivo sepeliri viscera busto，and Faery Queen II 8． 16 （quoted by Munro），To be entombed in the raven or the kight．That this fancy for poetic prose was with Gorgias a＇ruling passion strong in death＇，is proved by the phrase used at the close of his life，＇At last Sleep lays me with his brother
 бvyoukiov ḋ $\sigma \mu$ évoos àma入入árropaı（Thompson＇s ed．of the Gorgias，p．184）， may be illustrated by Waller＇s lines，The soul＇s dark cottage，battered and decayed，Lets in new light through chinks that time has made］．
$\lambda$ ójou］prose，opposed to $\pi$ oínбts．infra § 9，c． 2 §§ 3 and 6，$\psi$ i入oì $\lambda$ ójot，

 for even the tragic writers no longer employ it（sc． $\boldsymbol{\imath} \hat{n} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \epsilon \xi \in \iota$ ）in the same way（as the earlier tragedians did），but just as they passed from the （trochaic）tetrameter to the iambic measure because of all other metres this most resembles prose，so also in the use of words（names or nouns） they have dropped all that are contrary to the usage of ordinary conver－ sation，and have dropped also those with which the earliest（dramatic） writers（subaudi noו＇бaıtes；especially Æschylus）used to adorn（their





compositions), a practice which is even now retained by the writers of hexameters (Epics) : it is absurd therefore to copy those who themselves no longer employ that (the original) style'.

ఱ̈бтер каi....ö̈тш каí] This tautological repetition of кaí in an antithesis is characteristic of Aristotle's style. [Cf. supra § 3.]


 passage is referred to. III 8. 4. Welcker, Nachtrag, p. 239.
ó $\mu$ ocórarov rồ ä̃ $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ ] In translating this I have purposely retained the ungrammatical and illogical 'other' with the superlative, because the same blunder is equally common in our own language. Swift, Tale of a Tub, 'The most perfect of all others', Hooker, Eccl. Pol. 'of all other, they are...most infallible'. Bacon, Essay Of Envy, ' one of the most able of his predecessors' (of whom he is not, and cannot be, one), 'of all other affections (envy) the most importune and continual'. The examina-
 [Plat. Gorg. p. 473 C$]$ ), and the analogies in English, is reserved for an Appendix [this Appendix was apparently never written, though its intended preparation is also hinted in Mr Cope's translation of the Gorgias, p. II. Compare note I to II 9. 9, тิ̂ע ä̀ $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ oi aúrovpyoì $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a]$.

סıádeктov] for 'common conversation' (properly dialogue): compare
 application 8cádeктos is the third and highest stage of 'sound', (I) noise, $\psi$ ó $\phi o s$, which even inanimate things, brute matter, wood and stone, are capable of producing : (2) $\phi \omega v \dot{\prime}, \phi \theta^{\prime}{ }^{\gamma} \gamma \mathbf{o s}$, the indistinct voice of an animal :
 of conversation, characteristic of humanity. This distinction lies in the power which man has, and other animals (I believe) want, of pronouncing consonants, which produce distinct, articulate words. On speech, as the characteristic of man, see Pol. 1 2, 1253 a 10, seq. where $\lambda$ óyos is substituted for סtá入єктos, [also Isocr. Paneg. § 48, тoûto $\mu$ óvov (sc. tov̀s
 50 , (ferae) rationis et orationis expertes, de Oratore I §§ 32, 33].
 language of tragedy to the level of common life, the earliest author (as we are told in c. 2. 5) was Euripides, in his later plays, which are to be carefully distinguished from such as the Medea, Hippolytus, and Ion. The change was completely carried out in the New Comedy of Menander, Philemon Diphilus, \&c. On this everyday character of Euripides' later and worse compositions-which are to be carefully distinguished from such as the Medea, Hippolytus and Ion-to which the language was








${ }^{1-1}$ [The rendering given at the foot of p. Ir follows Beaker's Oxford ed. of
 dфeiкa $\sigma \cdot$ but there is nothing to shew that Mr Cope deliberately preferred this to the text as printed in Bekker's third edition ; which is also approved in Spengel's note, except that he would strike out the first dфeixaow, and not the second.]
made to conform, see Müller, Hist. Gr. Lit. ch. xxv. §§ 2, 3. In Arist. Ran. 959, Euripides is made to take credit for it, oikeía $\pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau^{\prime}$ eíááy $\omega \nu$, is $\chi \rho \omega^{\prime} \mu \in \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\prime}$, otis $\boldsymbol{\xi} \dot{v} \nu \in \sigma \mu \in \nu$.
§ 10. 'And therefore it is plain that we must not go into exact detail in describing all that may be said about style, but confine ourselves to the kind of which we are now speaking (i.e. the use of it in Rhetoric). The other (the general view of the subject) has been treated in the Poetics'.

There is a useful note on the various senses of $\dot{a} \kappa p i \beta \in t a$ in Aristotle in Grant's Ethics, I 7. 18. Here it is used in the first of these, of accuracy, or exactness, as shewn in minute detail, a complete survey of an entire subject.

CHAP. II.
Some general remarks upon Style and its virtues, and the various classifications of these in ancient and modern systems of Rhetoric, are given in the Introduction, as preliminary to the paraphrase of this chapter, pp. 279-282. [Volkmann, die Rhetorik der Griechen ind Römer, § 43.]
§ I. 'Let so much suffice for the consideration (observation) of that
 determined) once for all that one virtue of style is to be perspicuous: for a sign of this is, that if the speech (or language) do not explain its meaning, it will fail to perform its own proper function'.

This is a reference to the rule first laid down by Plat. Rep. I 352 D seq., and adopted by Aristotle who constantly recurs to it -see especially Eth. Nic. II 5 , init.-that the virtue or excellence of anything, knife, horse, or anything that can be employed as an instrument, is determined by its ${ }^{\text {epyov}}$ or special function, in the due performance of which it lies. If the special function of language is to explain one's meaning, it is plain that if it fail to do that-if it is not perspicuous-it does not । answer its intended purpose.







'And neither mean nor exaggerated' (beyond or above the true valuation of the subject it is employed upon, turgid, pompous, inflated), 'but decent, appropriate, suitable' (a precept of propriety): 'for though it may be (ivos) poetical language is not tame, yet it is by no means
 тanetvìv єiva. These are the two indispensable excellences of style, (I) clearness or perspicuity, and (2) propriety. On these see Introduction, p. 280.
§ 2. 'Of nouns and verbs' (the ultimate elements, and principal components, of language: see Introd. Appendix A to Bk. III. p. 37 I . Poet. XXI 8-9) 'perspicuity is produced by (the use of) proper names, a character not tame but ornate is imparted by all the rest of the (kinds of) words which are enumerated in the Poetics (c. XXI 4): to alter language in this way' (from the received and familiar expressions to which we are accustomed), 'invests it with a higher dignity' (because it makes it unusual, and strange; not familiar, which 'breeds contempt'): 'for men have the same feeling in regard of language as they have to strangers as compared with their fellow-citizens' (they disregard those whom they are in the habit of seeing every day, but are struck with the appearance of strangers, and pay them attention, if not always respect). To the note on кúpıa óvó $\mu a \tau a$, Introd. p. 282, note 2, add that in the Rhet. ad Alex. 25 (26) 1, and 30 (3I) 6, these are called oikeía 'proper', by a different metaphor.
 $\lambda a ́ t \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ (which explains it : comp.Poet. xxiI 3 infra). So Poet. Xxi 4, and

 term is 'a change out of, or departure from óvómara кúpıa, the vulgar language, the ordinary mode of expression', for which something novel, unusual, striking is substituted. Isocr. $\pi \in \rho \grave{2} \dot{\nu} \nu \tau \iota \delta o ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ § 179, $\lambda$ óyous





 $\chi \rho \eta \eta^{\sigma} \epsilon \omega$. Ernesti, Lex. Techn. Gr. s. v.
§ 3. 'And therefore a foreign air must be given to the language; for people are admirers of (or wonder at) what is far off, remote, and









all that is wonderful (excites surprise, raises our curiosity) is agreeable'.

 and the gratification of curiosity in learning: see the note.
$\left.\xi \in \ell_{\eta \nu}\right]$ infra § 6, $\xi \in \nu$ ckóv. Poet. XXII 3.
' Now in verse of all kinds there are many wass of producing this effect, and there they are appropriate, because the subject (circumstances) and the characters (persons) of the story (the fable or poem) are further removed' from common life; stand out of, and above, the ordinary level of humanity, Hist. An. 1 14. 1)-'but in prose compositions these (modes of giving novelty and variety to the language) must be much more sparingly used' ( $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \boldsymbol{r e}^{\prime} o v$, or are appropriate to fewer occasions, тov̂ $\theta$ ', or rather rav̂ $\theta$ ', ápнórтєt, Buhle), 'because the subject (theme, argument ${ }^{1}$ ) is less (lower, less elevated),-(and this is true a fortiori in prose) for even in the other (in poetry) if a slave or a very young man were to use fine language it would be rather unbecoming, or (if any one else did so) on a very trifling subject, but on the contrary even in that' (poetry, not 'prose' as Victorius), 'propriety consists in a due contraction and expansion (amplification)'; the adaptation of the language to the circumstances, raising or lowering it as the occasion requires. Comp. Cic. de Orat. III 38. 153. Orat. LX 202. Also XXI 70, ut enim in vita sic in oratione nihil est difficilius quam quid deceat videre. IIfénov appellant hoc Graeci; nos dicamus sane decorum. § 72, Quam enim indecorum est de stilicidiis quum apud unum iudicem dicas amplissimis verbis et locis uti communibus, de maiestate populi Romani summisse et subtiliter! De stilicidiis dicere illustrates $\pi \in \rho \stackrel{i}{\lambda} i_{i a v}$ $\mu \kappa \kappa \rho \omega \bar{\nu}$. On the language of poetry and prose, comp. Isocr. Evag. §§ 8-I I.



 Fr. p. ${ }^{261}$ c.
${ }^{1}$ vizó $\theta$ ecus, anything that is subjected as a foundation, a supposition or hypothesis, the basis of an argument, a first principle assumed, a theory, an underlying principle on which a scheme is to be built, the plot (ground plan) of a play, and so forth.







§ 4. 'Hence-from the necessity of paying attention to the selection of appropriate language in respect of characters and subjects-may be inferred ( 8,0 ) the necessity of disguising the art employed, and of avoiding the appearance of speaking, not naturally, but artificially' ( $\pi \lambda$ árreı̀ fingere, of fiction, or artificial composition), 'for the one is
 $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda a ́ \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \gamma \grave{a} \rho$ ठoket.) 'For people take offence at (lit. are at variance with, in opposition to) (one who employs artifice) as at one who has a design upon them, just as they do at mixed wines'.

 From this curious coincidence it seems that " mixed wine" must have been proverbial for a concealed enemy : mixed wine, 'the mixing of liquors', being, as was supposed, of a much more intoxicating character than unmixed. Philinus is arguing against $\pi$ o七кi $\lambda_{\eta} \tau \rho \circ \phi \dot{\eta}$ : simple food is always best.
' And as is the case with Theodorus' voice (lit. Theodorus' voice is affected) in comparison with that of all the rest of the actors' (there should

 art, an artificial voice assuming the appearance of one natural and simple): 'for his voice appears to be that of the speaker (though it is in reality disguised), but the others as though they belonged to other people' (were assumed, with the character represented).

Theodorus, a celebrated tragic actor, is mentioned-generally with Polus or Aristodemus-by Dem. de F. L. § 274, bis; Arist. Pol. IV (viI) 17, sub fin., 1336628 , from which it appears that, like other great artists and performers, ancient and modern, he presumed upon his reputation and artistic skill: also by Plutarch, frequently, as Bellone an pace cl. f. Ath. c. 6,348 F, de sui laud. c. 7, 545 F (a dictum of his to Satyrus the comic poet), Praecepta gerendae reipublicae, c. 21, 816 F, Theodorus
 by Diogenes Laertius, who at the end of his account of Aristippus, II $8, \S 103,4$, enumerates twenty Theodoruses (including the philosopher who gives occasion to this digression), and amongst them one
 subject so germane to the profession of a tragic actor, that, although Diogenes says no more about him, one cannot help suspecting that he must be the same with the one here mentioned. Fabricius in his catalogue of Theodoruses, Vol. x, names him with a special reference to the passage of Aristotle's Politics, and a general one to Plutarch,









Valckenaer Diatribe ad Eur．Fragm．p． 182 b．He is omitted in Smith＇s Biographical Dictionary．
§ 5．＇And this cheat（disguise，delusion）is fairly effected＇（the assumed character escapes observation，is stolen from the view）＇if the composer selects for his composition words out of the ordinary language （of common life）；such as are the verses of Euripides，who gave us the earliest specimen（hint or glimpse，vimó）（of this kind of writing）＇．
 ó àkpoarís．Rhet．ad Alex． 15 （16）§§ 5，and 6，к入émтetv тウ̀̀ $\mu a \rho \tau \nu \rho i a \nu$,







 （＂captata furtim auditorum attentione，＂Reiske）．Bacon，Essays，Of great Place，＂And do not think to steale it．＂
vinédeck€］as I have pointed out，Introd．p．284，note 2，q．v．，may also signify＇traced as a guide＇，for his successors to follow．See also p．285，note 1，on Euripides＇style，and Archimelus＇epigram there given．
＇And of the nouns and verbs＇（or subject and predicate，Introd． p．371，Appendix A to Bk．III），＇of which the speech（or language，in general）is composed，of which the nouns have so many kinds as have been considered in the treatise on Paetry＇（c．XxI，where，in § 4，eight varieties are enumerated，and then defined seriatim，§§ 5－20），＇of these words，foreign or obsolete，and（long）compound words＇（Aeschylean compounds），＇and words invented（manufactured for the occasion），are to be rarely employed，and in rare places（on rare occasions）；where （these are），we will state by and by：（in cc． 3 and 7）．The why，has been already stated；and that（the why）is because it（the use of them） varies（from the ordinary standard）towards，in the direction of，exag－ geration（or excess）beyond propriety（what is becoming）＇．









§ 6. 'The proper (ordinary) name, and the special name of anything' (oikeiov, the thing's own or right name, its special designation, Victorius), 'and the metaphor, are alone serviceable for the language of prose. And a sign of this is, that these alone are used by everybody (are of universal application); for everyone makes use of metaphors ${ }^{1}$, and the common' (sanctioned by common usage) 'and appropriate words in his ordinary conversation: and therefore it is clear that good composition will have a foreign air (an air of novelty, something unusual, above the flatness and monotony of ordinary, vulgar, talk: § 3), that (the art employed in it) may escape detection (pass unobserved, § 4), and that it will be clear and perspicuous, (in virtue of the kúpıa and oikeía òvópata). And in these, as we said ( $\overline{j p}$, in $\S \S 1,3,4,5,6$ ), consists the excellence of the rhetorical speech ${ }^{2}$.

With the 'foreign', unusual character of good composition, comp. De-


 eùkaraфрóvqтos.
 $\Phi$ Étepot : the common, usual, established, term, for expressing anything, opposed to the foreign and barbarous, or archaic and obsolete $\gamma \lambda \bar{\omega}$ mra. The word derives its special meaning from the original signification of кúpoos, 'carrying authority', 'authoritative'; whence 'authorised, established, fixed (by authority), settled', as кv̀ poos vópos, loo $\gamma \mu a$, кvpia $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\rho} \rho a$,
 certain times on special occasions : and hence applied to the established, settled, regular name of a thing. See further on кúpov ävoнa in note 2, Introd. pp. 282, 3. [On кúplos, compare notes on I 2.4 and 3.4.]
oikeiov övoua expresses much the same thing by a different metaphor. It is something 'of one's own', appropriate, peculiar, characteristic, special. This is the Latin 'nomen proprium', of which Cicero says, de Or. III 37, 149, quale propria sunt, et cert ('definite') quasi vocabula rerum, paine una natal cum rebus isis (naturally belonging to them). From these are distinguished quad transferuntur (all metaphorical words)
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et quasi alieno in loco collocantur: aut ios quae novamus et facimus ipsi (all foreign innovations on the ordinary language, aliena, Cicero, $\gamma \lambda \hat{\lambda} \tau \tau a$,
 кúpıa and oiкeía. Yet, as Victorius has pointed out, he uses terms exactly corresponding to those of Aristotle: de Or. III 39, 159, quod omnes translatis et alienis magis quam propriis et suis. For even if we understand here suis of their own language (as I suppose we should), this is immediately followed by nam si res suum nomen et vocabulum proprium non habet; and in pro Caecina, c. $18 \$ 51$, we have, res ut omnes suis certis ac propriis vocabulis nominentur. oikeios stands for кúpıos, Metaph.


§ 7. This is a parenthetical note: it has little to do with Rhetoric except so far as it occupies common ground with poetry, in the use of synonyms. 'Of names (words) homonyms (ambiguous words, with more than one meaning) are useful to the Sophist' (the fallacious reasoner ; see II 24.2, the topic of ím由vرuia, and the note)-'for those are the (principal) instruments of his (logical) frauds or cheats; to the poet, synonyms'. The homonym and the synonyme are defined at the commencement of the Categories. The former is a word of more than one signification, of which the several definitions do not agree; so that the name being the same, the one signification can be employed fallaciously for the other : synonyms are words which can be variously applied, in which the name and the definition (or meaning) do agree; as animal, can be said with truth of man and ox. Trendelenburg, El. Log. Ar. § 42, p. 116, on synonyms. Of hononyms Quintilian says, Inst. Or. vil 9. 2, singula afferunt errorem, quum pluribus rebus aut hominibus eadem appellatio est, (o $\rho \omega \nu v \mu i a$ dicitur) ut Gallus; avem enim, an gentem, an nomen, an fortunam corporis significet incertum est: et Aiax Telamonis an Oilei filius. Verba quoque quaedam diversos intellectus habent, $u t$ cerno : (with the application of it in suits of law). Of this logical application of kakovpyeiv, see the examples quoted in note on I I. 10.
'By proper and synonymous I mean such words as mopev́eo $\theta a t$ and ßadijetv: these are both of them proper and identical in meaning'. According to Trendelenburg, u.s., mopev́e $\theta$ at is the genus and $\beta$ adísev the species, both predicable of animals in the same sense: "Aristoteles enim constanter vocabulum ( $\sigma v \nu \omega \dot{v} \nu \mu o s$ ) ita frequentavit, ut vel eiusdem generis formas vel genus et species, quatenus communi nomine comprehenduntur, synonyma diceret." The use of these to the poet lies




 ad Philebum Platonis tradit Democritum nomina vocales imagines rerum
 $\Delta \eta \mu$ óкрıтоs．＂Victorius．Aristotle himself，de Interpretatione，sub init．16a3，
 $\boldsymbol{j}_{\boldsymbol{j} о \iota} \boldsymbol{\mu} \mu a \tau a$, signs or representatives，and copies，of mental affections，i．e． impressions，a theory quite different from that of Plato，which is here adopted．On the terms applied by Aristotle to express the nature of words，see Waitz，on Organon $16 a 4$ ．Of the four employed，he says， $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \beta o \lambda o \nu$ is a subjective $\sigma \eta \mu \varepsilon i o \nu$ ，and $\dot{\delta} \mu \boldsymbol{i} \omega \mu a$ an objective $\mu i \mu \eta \mu a$ ．On imitation and the natural love of it，the origin and foundation of all the fine arts，see the first three chapters of the Poetics．In c．4，init．imitation or mimicry is described as natural to man from infancy，and characteristic of humanity．［Dionysius Halic．de comp．verb．p． 94 （quoted in Farrar＇s

 $\pi \rho \dot{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\mu} \mu \tau \alpha$ ．］
rà $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ óvó $\mu a \tau a$ к．т．入．］This is introduced to account for the poets hav－ ing been the first who devoted themselves to the study of style or language， in this sense．Words being the copies of things，the poets，whose object is imitation，addicted themselves to the study of them，in order to be able better to represent the things of which they were images．Vic－ torius．
 which was naturally combined the criticism of Homer，are mentioned in Plat．Ion． 530 C ，Metrodorus of Lampsacus，Stesimbrotus of Thasos （Xenoph．Conv．III 6），and Glaucon，probably of Teos，mentioned above， § 3.
§ 9．＇And as the reputation which the poets acquired in spite of the simplicity of what they said（the silliness of the thoughts expressed）was thought（by those who imitated them）to be due to their language，it was for this reason that the language（of prose）first took a poetical colour， as that of Gorgias．And still，even at this day，the mass of the unedu－ cated think the discourses of speakers of this kind mighty fine．Such however is not the fact，but the language of prose and poetry is distinct＇．

To the same effect Dionysius，de Lys．Iud．c．3，（v．457，Reiske）．Ly－ sias＇predecessors were not of his opinion about style－his was the à $\phi \in \lambda \dot{\eta} s$




 i8七由́rŋข，к．т．入．This was the new style introduced by Gorgias and his followers Polus and Licymnius（Alcidamas，\＆c．）．Hermogenes，$\pi \in \rho i$











 of Gorgias, Quum enim videret oratores cum severitate audiri poetas autem cum voluptate, tum dicitur numeros secutus quibus etiam in oratione uteremur, quum iucunditatis causa tum ut varietas occurreret satietati. So Theophrastus, Dion. Lys. Iud. c. 14, condemns this affected poetical language of the Sicilian school of rhetoricians as childish,



On Gorgias' novel and poetical style and the figures that he introduced into Rhetoric, see Camb. Fourn. of Classical and Sacred Philology, No. viI Vol. III pp. 66-7, 73-5, and on the rhetorical figures, which are classified, 69-72. Comp. Cic. Orat. § 175 [paria paribus adiuncta et similiter definita itemque contrariis relata contraria, quae sua sponte, etiamsi id non agas, cadunt plerumque numerose, Gorgias primus invenit, sed eis est usus intemperantius. See also Blass, die Attische Beredsamkeit, 1 esp. pp. 57-64. As a specimen of the poetical style of Gorgias we have
 be found in the poets Lucretius and Spenser, Lucr. v 924, viva videns vivo sepeliri viscera busto, and Faery Queen in 8.16 (quoted by Munro), To be entombed in the raven or the kight. That this fancy for poetic prose was with Gorgias a 'ruling passion strong in death', is proved by the phrase used at the close of his life, 'At last Sleep lays me with his brother
 бvyoukiov à $\sigma \mu$ évows àma入入árтoual (Thompson's ed. of the Gorgias, p. 184), may be illustrated by Waller's lines, The soul's dark cottage, battered and decayed, Lets in new light through chinks that time has made].


 for even the tragic writers no longer employ it (sc. тй $\lambda \in \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon$ ) in the same way (as the earlier tragedians did), but just as they passed from the (trochaic) tetrameter to the iambic measure because of all other metres this most resembles prose, so also in the use of words (names or nouns) they have dropped all that are contrary to the usage of ordinary conversation, and have dropped also those with which the earliest (dramatic) writers (subaudi motifaltes; especially Æschylus) used to adorn (their





compositions), a practice which is even now retained by the writers of hexameters (Epics): it is absurd therefore to copy those who themselves no longer employ that (the original) style'.
 thesis is characteristic of Aristotle's style. [Cf. supra § 3.]


 passage is referred to. III 8.4. Welcker, Nachtrag, p. 239.
ípoớrato $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ă $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ ] In translating this I have purposely retained the ungrammatical and illogical 'other' with the superlative, because the same blunder is equally common in our own language. Swift, Tale of a Tub, 'The most perfect of all others', Hooker, Eccl. Pol.' 'of all other, they are...most infallible'. Bacon, Essay Of Envy, 'one of the most able of his predecessors' (of whom he is not, and cannot be, one), 'of all other affections (envy) the most importune and continual'. The examina-
 [Plat. Gorg. p. 473 C]), and the analogies in English, is reserved for an Appendix [this Appendix was apparently never written, though its intended preparation is also hinted in Mr Cope's translation of the


סiá̀eктov] for 'common conversation' (properly dialogue): compare c. 2. 5, $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ eiwQuia dáàekros, and Poet. xXII 14 In a somewhat different application $\delta$ oridectos is the third and highest stage of 'sound', ( I ) noise,廿ódos, which even inanimate things, brute matter, wood and stone, are capable of producing : (2) $\phi$ wví, $\phi \theta^{\prime}$ 'ros, the indistinct voice of an animal: and (3) סí̈̀єктos, the distinct utterance of the $\mu$ épores äv $\theta \rho a \pi t o t$, the power of conversation, characteristic of humanity. This distinction lies in the power which man has, and other animals (I believe) want, of pronouncing consonants, which produce distinct, articulate words. On speech, as the characteristic of man, see Pol. I 2, $1253 a$ 10, seq. where $\lambda$ óyos is substituted for 8ıádekros, [also Isocr. Paneg. § 48, тồro $\mu$ óvò (sc. тò̀s
 50 , (ferae) rationis et orationis expertes, de Oratore I §32,33].
 language of tragedy to the level of common life, the earliest author (as we are told in c. 2. 5) was Euripides, in his later plays, which are to be carefully distinguished from such as the Medea, Hippolytus, and Ion. The change was completely carried out in the New Comedy of Menander, Philemon Diphilus, \&c. On this everyday character of Euripides' later and worse compositions-which are to be carefully distinguished from such as the Medea, Hippolytus and Ion--to which the language was









${ }^{1-1}$ [The rendering given at the foot of p. II follows Beaker's Oxford ed. of

 to the text as printed in Bekker's third edition ; which is also approved in Spengel's note, except that he would strike out the first $\alpha \phi$ elisa $\sigma \nu$, and not the second.]
made to conform, see Müller, Hist. Gr. Lit. ch. xxv. §§ 2, 3. In Arist. Ran. 959, Euripides is made to take credit for it, oikeía $\pi \rho \alpha^{\prime} \gamma \mu a \tau^{\prime}$ eióóq $\omega \nu$, Dis $\chi \rho \omega_{\mu} \mu \theta^{\prime}$, oi $\boldsymbol{\xi} \dot{\nu} \nu \in \sigma \mu \in \nu$.
§ 10. 'And therefore it is plain that we must not go into exact detail in describing all that may be said about style, but confine ourselves to the kind of which we are now speaking (i.e. the use of it in Rhetoric). The other (the general view of the subject) has been treated in the Poetics'.

There is a useful note on the various senses of $\dot{a} \times \rho i \neq c i a$ in Aristotle in Grant's Ethics, I 7.18. Here it is used in the first of these, of accuracy, or exactness, as shewn in minute detail, a complete survey of an entire subject.
CHAP. II.

Some general remarks upon Style and its virtues, and the various classifications of these in ancient and modern systems of Rhetoric, are given in the Introduction, as preliminary to the paraphrase of this chapter, pp. 279-282. [Volkmann, die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer, § 43.]
§ I. 'Let so much suffice for the consideration (observation) of that
 determined) once for all that one virtue of style is to be perspicuous: for a sign of this is, that if the speech (or language) do not explain its meaning, it will fail to perform its own proper function'.

This is a reference to the rule first laid down by Plat. Rep. I 352 D seq., and adopted by Aristotle who constantly recurs to it -see especially Eth. Nice. II 5 , init.-that the virtue or excellence of anything, knife, horse, or anything that can be employed as an instrument, is deter-
 it lies. If the special function of language is to explain one's meaning, it is plain that if it fail to do that-if it is not perspicuous-it does not answer its intended purpose.







'And neither mean nor exaggerated' (beyond or above the true valuation of the subject it is employed upon, turgid, pompous, inflated), 'but decent, appropriate, suitable' (a precept of propriety): 'for though it may be ("̈ $\sigma \omega s$ ) poetical language is not tame, yet it is by no means
 тatecvìv civa.. These are the two indispensable excellences of style, (I) clearness or perspicuity, and (2) propriety. On these see Introduction, p. 280.
§ 2. 'Of nouns and verbs' (the ultimate elements, and principal components, of language: see Introd. Appendix A to Bk. III. p. 371. Poet. XXI 8-9) 'perspicuity is produced by (the use of) proper names, a character not tame but ornate is imparted by all the rest of the (kinds of) words which are enumerated in the Poetics (c. XXI 4): to alter language in this way' (from the received and familiar expressions to which we are accustomed), 'invests it with a higher dignity' (because it makes it unusual, and strange ; not familiar, which 'breeds contempt'): 'for men have the same feeling in regard of language as they have to strangers as compared with their fellow-citizens' (they disregard those whom they are in the habit of seeing every day, but are struck with the appearance of strangers, and pay them attention, if not always respect). To the note on кúpıa óvó $\mu a \tau a$, Introd. p. 282, note 2, add that in the Rhet. ad Alex. 25 (26) 1, and 30 (31) 6, these are called oikeia 'proper', by a different metaphor.
 $\lambda a ́ t r \epsilon \iota \nu$ (which explains it : comp.Poet. XXII 3 infra). So Poet. XXI 4, and

 term is 'a change out of, or departure from óvó $\mu a r a$ кúpıa, the vulgar language, the ordinary mode of expression', for which something novel,






 $\chi \rho \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega \mathrm{s}$. Ernesti, Lex. Techn. Gr. s. v.
§3. 'And therefore a foreign air must be given to the language; for people are admirers of (or wonder at) what is far off, remote, and









all that is wonderful (excites surprise, raises our curiosity) is agreeable'.

 and the gratification of curiosity in learning : see the note.
$\xi \in \nu \eta \nu]$ infra $\S 6, \xi \in \nu \iota x o ́ v$. Poet. XXII 3.
' Now in verse of all kinds there are many ways of producing this effect, and there they are appropriate, because the subject (circumstances) and the characters (persons) of the story (the fable or poem) are further removed' from common life ; stand out of, and above, the ordinary level of humanity, Hist. An. I 14 I)-' but in prose compositions these (modes of giving novelty and variety to the language) must be much more sparingly used' ( $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau$ 'ov, or are appropriate to fewer
 (theme, argument ${ }^{1}$ ) is less (lower, less elevated),-(and this is true a fortiori in prose) for even in the other (in poetry) if a slave or a very young man were to use fine language it would be rather unbecoming, or (if any one else did so) on a very trifling subject, but on the contrary even in that' (poetry, not 'prose' as Victorius), 'propriety consists in a due contraction and expansion (amplification)'; the adaptation of the language to the circumstances, raising or lowering it as the occasion requires. Comp. Cic. de Orat. III 38. 153. Orat. LX 202. Also XXI 70, ut enim in vita sic in oratione nihil est difficilius quam quid deceat videre. Пре́тоv appellant hoc Graeci; nos dicamus sane decorum. § 72, Quam enim indecorum est de stilicidiis quum apud unum iudicem dicas amplissimis verbis et locis uti communibus, de maiestate populi Romani summisse et subtiliter! De stilicidiis dicere illustrates пє $\rho \mathrm{i}$ 入iav $\mu \kappa \kappa \rho \omega \bar{\nu}$. On the language of poetry and prose, comp. Isocr. Evag. §§ 8-I I.



 Fr. p. 261 c.
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 ${ }^{1} \mu \in \mu$ ı $\boldsymbol{\mu} \mu$ érous•
§4. 'Hence-from the necessity of paying attention to the selection of appropriate language in respect of characters and subjects-may be inferred ( $\delta \iota 0$ ) the necessity of disguising the art employed, and of avoiding the appearance of speaking, not naturally, but artificially' ( $\pi \lambda$ árreır fingere, of fiction, or artificial composition), 'for the one is persuasive, the other the contrary', (comp. c. 8 § r, rò $\mu e ̀ \nu ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ a i \pi i \theta a v o v, ~$ $\pi \in \pi \lambda a ́ \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \gamma \grave{a} \rho$ 8okeî.) 'For people take offence at (lit. are at variance with, in opposition to) (one who employs artifice) as at one who has a design upon them, just as they do at mixed wines'.

Victorius quotes Plut. Symp. IV p. 66i D, 8ıò фєíyovat ròv $\mu \notin \mu \iota \gamma \mu$ ívov
 From this curious coincidence it seems that "mixed wine" must have been proverbial for a concealed enemy : mixed wine, 'the mixing of liquors', being, as was supposed, of a much more intoxicating character than unmixed. Philinus is arguing against $\pi о \kappa к i \lambda_{\eta} \tau \rho о \phi \dot{\eta}$ : simple food is always best.
' And as is the case with Theodorus' voice (lit. Theodorus' voice is affected) in comparison with that of all the rest of the actors' (there should
 continued from rov̂ro yà $\pi<\theta a \nu o ́ v:$ it is an instance of the art disguising art, an artificial voice assuming the appearance of one natural and simple): 'for his voice appears to be that of the speaker (though it is in reality disguised), but the others as though they belonged to other people' (were assumed, with the character represented).

Theodorus, a celebrated tragic actor, is mentioned-generally with Polus or Aristodemus-by Dem. de F. L. § 274, bis; Arist. Pol. IV (vir) 17, sub fin., $1336 b 28$, from which it appears that, like other great artists and performers, ancient and modern, he presumed upon his reputation and artistic skill : also by Plutarch, frequently, as Bellone an pace cl. f. Ath. c. 6,348 F, de sui laud. c. 7, 545 F (a dictum of his to Satyrus the comic poet), Praecepta gerendae reipublicae, c. 21, 816 F, Theodorus
 by Diogenes Laertius, who at the end of his account of Aristippus, II 8, § IO3, 4, enumerates twenty Theodoruses (including the philosopher who gives occasion to this digression), and amongst them one
 subject so germane to the profession of a tragic actor, that, although Diogenes says no more about him, one cannot help suspecting that he must be the same with the one here mentioned. Fabricius in his catalogue of Theodoruses, Vol. X, names him with a special reference to the passage of Aristotle's Politics, and a general one to Plutarch,









Valckenaer Diatribe ad Eur. Fragm. p. 182 b. He is omitted in Smith's Biographical Dictionary.
§ 5. 'And this cheat (disguise, delusion) is fairly effected' (the assumed character escapes observation, is stolen from the view) 'if the composer selects for his composition words out of the ordinary language (of common life) ; such as are the verses of Euripides, who gave us the earliest specimen (hint or glimpse, $\mathfrak{v}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \mathrm{o}^{\prime}$ ) (of this kind of writing)'.









 ("captata furtim auditorum attentione," Reiske). Bacon, Essays, Of great Place, "And do not think to steale it."
únédecke] as I have pointed out, Introd. p. 284, note 2, q. v., may also signify 'traced as a guide', for his successors to follow. See also p. 285, note 1, on Euripides' style, and Archimelus' epigram there given.
'And of the nouns and verbs' (or subject and predicate, Introd. p. 371, Appendix A to Bk. III), 'of which the speech (or language, in general) is composed, of which the nouns have so many kinds as have been considered in the treatise on Poetry' (c. XXI, where, in § 4, eight varieties are enumerated, and then defined seriatim, §§ 5-20), ' of these words, foreign or obsolete, and (long) compound words' (Aeschylean compounds), 'and words invented (manufactured for the occasion), are to be rarely employed, and in rare places (on rare occasions) ; where (these are), we will state by and by: (in cc. 3 and 7). The why, has been already stated; and that (the why) is because it (the use of them) varies (from the ordinary standard) towards, in the direction of, exaggeration (or excess) beyond propriety (what is becoming)'.




AR. III.






§ 6. 'The proper (ordinary) name, and the special name of anything' (oikeiov, the thing's own or right name, its special designation, Victorius), 'and the metaphor, are alone serviceable for the language of prose. And a sign of this is, that these alone are used by everybody (are of universal application); for everyone makes use of metaphors ${ }^{1}$, and the common' (sanctioned by common usage) 'and appropriate words in his ordinary conversation : and therefore it is clear that good composition will have a foreign air (an air of novelty, something unusual, above the flatness and monotony of ordinary, vulgar, talk: § 3), that (the art employed in it) may escape detection (pass unobserved, § 4), and that it will be clear and perspicuous, (in virtue of the кúpıa and oikeía óvó $\mu a \tau a$ ). And in these, as we said ( $\dot{\eta} \nu$, in $§ § 1,3,4,5,6$ ), consists the excellence of the rhetorical speech ${ }^{2}$.

With the 'foreign', unusual character of good composition, comp. De-


 eủkaтaфрórŋтоs.
 $\Phi$ ircpot: the common, usual, established, term, for expressing anything, opposed to the foreign and barbarous, or archaic and obsolete $\gamma \lambda \omega ิ \tau \tau a$. The word derives its special meaning from the original signification of kúpıos, 'carrying authority', 'authoritative'; whence 'authorised, esta-

 certain times on special occasions : and hence applied to the established, settled, regular name of a thing. See further on кúpıo övoua in note 2, Introd. pp. 282, 3. [On кúpıos, compare notes on 12.4 and 3.4.]
oikeiov öyoua expresses much the same thing by a different metaphor. It is something 'of one's own', appropriate, peculiar, characteristic, special. This is the Latin 'nomen proprium', of which Cicero says, de Or. III 37, 149, quae propria sunt, et certa ('definite') quasi vocabula rerum, paene una nata cum rebus ipsis (naturally belonging to them). From these are distinguished quae transferuntur (all metaphorical words)
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et quasi alieno in loco collocantur: aut iis quae novamus et facimus ipsi (all foreign innovations on the ordinary language, aliena, Cicero, $\gamma \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \tau \mathbf{r a}$, дıллä д̀д́дата, петоппрíva, \&c.). Cicero and the Latins do not distinguish кúpıa and oikeía. Yet, as Victorius has pointed out, he uses terms exactly corresponding to those of Aristotle: de Or. III 39, 159, quod omnes translatis et alienis magis quam propriis et suis. For even if we understand here suis of their own language (as I suppose we should), this is immediately followed by nam si res suum nomen et vocabulum proprium non habet; and in pro Caecina, c. $18 \$ 5 \mathrm{I}$, we have, res ut omnes suis certis ac propriis vocabulis nominentur. oikeios stands for kúpoos, Metaph.


§ 7. This is a parenthetical note: it has little to do with Rhetoric except so far as it occupies common ground with poetry, in the use of synonyms. 'Of names (words) homonyms (ambiguous words, with more than one meaning) are useful to the Sophist' (the fallacious reasoner ; see II 24.2, the topic of opwvpia, and the note)-'for those are the (principal) instruments of his (logical) frauds or cheats; to the poet, synonyms'. The homonym and the synonym are defined at the commencement of the Categories. The former is a word of more than one signification, of which the several definitions do not agree; so that the name being the same, the one signification can be employed fallaciously for the other : synonyms are words which can be variously applied, in which the name and the definition (or meaning) do agree ; as animal, can be said with truth of man and ox. Trendelenburg, El. Log. Ar. §42, p. 116, on synonyms. Of hononyms Quintilian says, Inst. Or. viI 9. 2, singula afferunt errorem, quum pluribus rebus aut hominibus eadem appellatio est, (ó $\mu \omega v v \mu i a ~ d i c i t u r) ~ u t ~ G a l l u s ; ~ a v e m ~ e n i m, ~ a n ~ g e n t e m, ~$ an nomen, an fortunam corporis significet incertum est: et Aiax Telamonis an Oilei flius. Verba quoque quaedam diversos intellectus habent, $u t$ cerno : (with the application of it in suits of law). Of this logical application of kakovpy泣, see the examples quoted in note on I I. 10 .
'By proper and synonymous I mean such words as ropevieg $\theta$ au and Baditev: these are both of them proper and identical in meaning'. According to Trendelenburg, u. s., mopéveroat is the genus and Baditciv the species, both predicable of animals in the same sense: "Aristoteles enim constanter vocabulum (ovvivupos) ita frequentavit, ut vel eiusdem generis formas vel genus et species, quatenus communi nomine comprehenduntur, synonyma diceret." The use of these to the poet lies





 in this, that they help him to give variety to his diction, and relieve him from the necessity of constantly repeating the same word.
' Now what each of these things is'-i.e. the things already enumerated, nomina propria, translata, $\sigma v v \propto \dot{v} \mu a$ \& $\&$. (Victorius)-' and the number of the kinds of metaphors, and that this, metaphor, is most effective both in poetry and prose, has been already stated, as we said

 пountukijs), in our work on poetry'. Max Schmidt, in his tract On the date of the Rhetoric, Halle, 1837 (frequently referred to in the Introd.), and before him Victorius, notices here, that the synonyms alone of all the words here referred to do not appear in the Poetics; from which each of them infers a lacuna in that work: more especially as Simplicius had left on record that Aristotle had treated of them in his book on poetry. There is another loss in that work indicated by a reference in Rhet. I II. 29 [and III 18.7] to the Poetics for an account of rò $\gamma \in \lambda \begin{gathered}\text { oiov, }\end{gathered}$ which is now no longer to be found there.
§ 8. 'And they require all the more diligent attention ( $\phi$ 人оoтoveiv ' labour con amore,' fond, affectionate, loving, care and pains), to be bestowed upon them in prose, in proportion as the sources from which prose draws its aids or supplies are fewer than those of verse': see ante § 3 . I have translated rogovire which seems much more likely than rogoûro. If the latter be retained, it can only mean 'so much as I have described', but where? or when? I have no doubt that roroưre is the right reading. ["oüra A (quod Bekkerum fugit) $Q$, unde iam Victorius roacour $\varphi$ restituit." Spengel.]
'And perspicuity' (perhaps rather, 'clearness' in the sense of vivid, graphic, representation ${ }^{1}$ ), 'and pleasure, and the foreign air, are conveyed by metaphor more than in any other way', (more than by any other kind of word which can be used to give an extraneous interest to

 Poet. xxili. 16. The pleasure derived from metaphors is that we learn something from them ; they bring into view hitherto unnoticed resemblances between things the most apparently dissimilar. тò ev̉ $\mu \epsilon \tau a \phi^{\prime} \rho \in \epsilon \nu$ rò ro öpoov $\theta$ ewpeiv, Poet. xxil 17. Top. Z 2, 140 a 9 . This is the fourth kind of metaphor, that from analogy, and by far the commonest and most attractive. On the pleasure of learning, see III. 21 and 23 , HI 1o. 2.
'And it can't be derived (acquired) from anyone else'. This does not of course mean that one writer or speaker cannot borrow a metaphor
7. Demetrius, however, $\pi \in \rho l$ 'Epuppelas $\$ 82$, (Spengel, Rhet. Gr. III 28r), says,

 the description.



from another; but that the invention of metaphors is a mark of original genius, and therefore cannot be taught, derived from another in the way of instruction. Not that metaphors in general are confined to men
 ginality more or less, and are marks of natural (not acquired) ability, or

 тò tò ö $\mu$ оьo $\theta \in \omega \rho \epsilon i \nu$ é $\sigma \tau i v$. Poet. 'XXII 17. And therefore, the more remote the resemblance between the two objects brought together by the metaphor, the more ingenuity and natural ability is required for detecting it.

Harris, Philol. Inq., Part II, ch. 10, takes this view of the meaning; "that metaphor is an effort of genius and cannot be taught is here again
 Whately, on the other hand, denies that this means, "as some interpreters suppose, that this power is entirely a gift of nature, and in no degree to be learnt: on the contrary he expressly affirms that the 'perception of resemblances' on which it depends is the fruit of 'philosophy': but he means that metaphors are not to be, like other words and phrases, selected from common use and transferred from one composition to another, but must be formed for the occasion" [Rhetoric, chap. III p. 277 ult.]. Whatever Aristotle may have said elsewhere, it is certain that what he says in the Poetics, and therefore in this passage which is repeated from it, is what Harris has described: the close connexion of $\pi a \rho^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{2} \lambda \lambda o v$ $\lambda a \beta e i \nu$ with the following eviguta shews this unmistakably. Besides this, a remark about borrowing metaphors from other people's speeches or writings is not only trivial in itself, but here altogether out of place: and if it were not, why should metaphors be singled out from all other forms of speech as things that should not be borrowed? Is not purloining your neighbour's thoughts or expressions or bons mots equally reprehensible in all cases? or may $\boldsymbol{\gamma \lambda \omega ิ \tau т a \iota ~ a n d ~ \pi є \pi о \imath \eta \mu e ́ v a ~ a n d ~ t h e ~ r e s t , ~ a l l ~ o f ~ t h e m ~ b e ~}$ 'borrowed', and metaphors alone excepted ? Victorius, according to Schrader, renders it, "non licet semper sumere ipsam ab alio auctore," which he approves, and interprets, that you musn't be always begging or borrowing your metaphors from others, when you can and ought to invent them yourself. In my copy of Vettori's Commentary [Petri Victorii Commentarii in Opera Aristotelis, 5 vols. folio, published at Florence, 1548-1583], these words do not occur: the passage is there explained, as it should be, of 'acquiring metaphors' from any one but oneself: they being due to a natural ingenuity. Victorius also says that this remark, upon the inventive power which they presuppose, is introduced as an additional recommendation of metaphors: and refers to one of the topics of Top. III., the
 what can't be procured from another, any native excellence or advantage, is superior to anything that can. Also c. $1,116 b 10$, rò $\phi \dot{\prime} \sigma \in \iota$ rov̂ $\mu \eta े$





 natural to the acquired.
§ 9. 'Epithets' (including not only single adjectives, but any ornamental or descriptive addition to a plain ö้ $\nu о \mu a$ кúpıov, as a sauce to a joint; see Introd. p. 289) 'and metaphors must be made appropriate (in the former, to the subjects to which they are applied, in the latter to those to which we transfer them from something else): this appropriateness will proceed from the proportion' (between the epithet or metaphor and the thing it is applied to in either case: "si ex proportion duxerimus, observaverimusque ut ipsa sibi mutuo respondent, similemque rationem inter se ha-
 will be apparent, glaring, (by the juxtaposition), because the opposition of two contraries becomes most apparent when they are placed side by side of one another. But (on the contrary) we must consider, as a scarlet coat is suitable to a youth, so also (what is suitable) to an old man: for the same dress is not becoming to both'.
 which occurs in the parallel passage, II 23. 30-is illustrated in note on 11 2. 1, and 1 7.31 [p. 141]. The observation that mapá $\lambda \lambda \eta \lambda a$ rà évavtia $\mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu$ фaiverat is a favourite one with Aristotle. The parallels from the Rhetoric are quoted in note on II 23. 27. Add Dem. de F. L. § 192,


An inappropriate epithet may be illustrated by the substitution of amabile and formosum for horrendum and inform in Virgil's line, Monstrum horrendum informe ingens oui lumen ademptum: a metaphor is inappropriate when you bring some incongruous notion into juxta-position with the object which you 'invest' with your metaphor, like an old man with the incongruous dress of a scarlet coat;-although viridis is not inappropriate to senectus, though greenness and old age might seem incongruous, because in this application of the metaphor the proportion or ratio is observed between the freshness implied in the green vegetation and the freshness and vigour of old age, and the two are thus brought under a common genus. When old age is called the evening of life the metaphor is appropriate, because there is a true proportion or analogy; evening : the day :: old age : man's life; evening and old age are under a common genus, viz. the close of a period, ìv rẹ̀ aúrê yévet, infra;
 Shakespeare [Hamlet, III i. 59] speaks of taking arms against a sea of troubles there is neither proportion nor congruity: and in such cases, when the two notions are placed side by side, and so brought directly into contrast, the incongruity becomes at once apparent. This kind of solecism is usually called 'confusion of metaphor'.







\& Io. 'And if you want to set off anything (if praise is your object), you must take your metaphor from the superior (better, more honourable or valuable) things that fall under the same genus; if blame, from the inferior. As an instance of my meaning; since contraries are (the extremes of the species) under the same genus, to say that one that prays, begs, and one that begs, prays, is to do this; because both of them are kinds of petition'. These are the two extremes of the genus petition, or solicitation; praying the highest form, begging the lowest; 'as also (besides others, ${ }_{\kappa} a^{i}$ ) Iphicrates (called) Callas (whom he wished to depreciate) $\mu \eta \tau \rho a-$ yúprys instead of daסoûरos ['a mendicant priest', instead of 'bearer of the mystic torch']. The other (Callias) replied, that he (his opponent) never could have been initiated (or he would have been incapable of such a mistake), else he would not have called him $\mu \eta \tau \rho a \gamma \dot{\rho} \rho \tau \eta s$ but Ba 8000 रos-for it is true (adds Aristotle, by way of explanation) that they are both attached to the service of a goddess (both come under the common genus 'servants of a goddess'), but the one is a term of honour, the other of dishonour'. It is much like calling the Precentor of a Cathedral a ballad-singer.

 rat, Categ. c. 6, 6 a 17.

Kalmias is the third of that name, the son of the third Hipponicus, of that noble and wealthy Athenian family, of which the heads received these names alternately during several generations, Arist. Ran. 283,
 ditary in his family, is especially assigned to him by Xenophon, Hellen. VI 3.3, Ka入入ías of $\delta a \delta o o_{0}$ os. His pride in this distinction would of course have rendered him much more susceptible to the slight conveyed by Iphicrates' ignorant, or malicious, mistake. The substitution of the one word for the other, though evidently interpreted by Callias (from his reply) as a mistake made in ignorance of the distinction between the two -perhaps wilfully, to save his dignity-is much more likely to have been intentional and malicious. Callas was a vain foolish mansee Xenoph. 1. c. § 3, ult. and Callas' speech \$s 4, 5, 6, -and Iphicrates, the self-made man, who had risen to distinction by his own merits, ég oi $\omega \nu$ cis oi a, would doubtless have enjoyed a joke at the expense of the pompous and empty 'descendant of Triptolemus' (Yen. l. c.) and hereditary סadoũos of the Great Mysteries. Xenophon mentions him as one of the ambassadors to the congress at Sparta in 371 b. C., in virtue of his here-

 ditary $\pi \rho \rho \xi \in v i a$ of that state. There is a good account of this Callias by Mr Elder in Smith's Biogr. Dict. He is the entertainer of the Sophists in the Protagoras, and the host of Xenophon's 'Banquet'. On Callias and his family, its wealth and splendour, see Böckh, Publ. Econ. of Athens, Bk. iv c. 3, pp. 42, 3 (Lewis' Transl.), and Heindorf's learned note on Protag. 3II.

The $\delta a \delta o v x i a$ was, as we have seen, an office of great distinction. The $\delta a \delta 0 \hat{x} 0$ s led the procession of the $\mu v \sigma r a t$ froin Athens to Eleusis on the fifth day of the great Eleusinia, the torch-day, $\dot{\eta}$ т $\omega \nu \lambda \lambda a \mu \pi a ́ \delta \omega \nu$ j $\mu \mathrm{e} \rho \mathrm{\rho}$. See Dict. Antiq. Art. 'Eleusinia,' p. 373 b. Rich, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Ant. s. v. p. 232.
$\mu \eta \tau \rho a y \dot{v} \rho \tau \eta s$, on the contrary, implies everything that is vile and contemptible: it is the designation of a class of profigate beggars, chiefly women, who attached themselves to the worship of some particular deity-usually Cybele, the Magna Mater, from which $\mu \eta \tau \rho a y \dot{v} \rho \tau \eta s$ is taken-at whose festivals they attended to ply their profession, that of àfipetv, collecting alms, stipem cogere, and then practised every kind of imposture and indulged in every variety of licentiousness. They seem also to have gone their rounds through the great houses in cities, Plat. Rep. II 364 b-c, fortune-telling, and with charms and spells (as to draw down the gods from heaven) and other nostrums for sale. They carried about with them an image of the goddess in whose name they asked alms. Lobeck, Aglaophamus, p. 629, compares them to mendicant friars or Béguines, and designates them viles Metragyrtas. Me-
 yúprךs (or M $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ ayúprtys, so Meineke, Fr. Comic. Gr., Menander, IV 163, on which see Lobeck, ibid. 645, note), and the 'I' $\rho$ eta, which, from the
 supposes (apparently with little reason) to have been directed against the M $\eta$ трayípra. Meineke, ib . Menand. IV 140 . Compare on their character, Antiphanes, Fragm. Mıбoтovípov, Meineke, Ib. III 86, aival $8^{8}$ intep-

 émaүoyai, p. II4. To this extremity Dionysius the younger, once tyrant


 themselves to a single goddess, though Cybele was their favourite, but also attached themselves to the service of Isis; and apparently to that of Demeter and Cora (from the present passage) ; of Opis and Arge, Hdt. Iv 35; and in general, of those whose worship was of an orgiastic character, see by all means Ruhnken ad Tim. p. 10, s. v. dyeipetv. Here there are two goddesses implied, Demeter in $8 q \delta 0000$ os, and Cybele in ${ }_{\mu \eta \tau \rho a y \text { úprns. There is a short article in Dict. Antig. on the subject }}$ under à $\mathbf{y} \rho \mathrm{p} \not \mathrm{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$.
$\dot{a} \gamma \epsilon i \rho \in i \nu$ is used to signify collecting alms, or begging, several times by Herodotus; twice, for instance, in IV 35. By Homer, àfeipec $\theta a t$ and àjup-



 'a vagabond', one that goes about collecting for a deity. Aesch. Agam. 1244, Cassandra of herself, kàovpév $8 \grave{e}$ фoırás, w's àvvprpía, Blomfield's
 Comic. ap. Meineke, Lys. II p. 746, Fragm. Cratin. $\Delta \rho a \pi \epsilon \tau$. II, Ib. II 51




The next is a case of the same kind ; of two possible designations of actors one takes the lowest and most contemptuous, the other the opposite and highest and most complimentary. Diovvookóakes represents them as parasites or flatterers, not worthy to be companions or friends of the god ; the lowest and most degraded form of service, of Dionysus the patron deity of the stage and its belongings (Aristophanes passim) rexuirat as 'artists', or 'artistes'-as the lower kind of professional performers, singers, dancers, posture-makers, are fond of calling themselves nowadays by way of dignifying their profession : the term is actually applied to them by Dem. de F. L. §212, of Philip who collected at a festival mávras rò̀s $\tau \epsilon \chi$ vitas ; on which Ulpian (quoted by Shilleto
 adds, ut aiunt in Graecis artificibus, Cic. pro Murena 13 (29). [Ar.
 поथnpoi єicıv; referred to by Aulus Gellius, $\mathrm{xx}_{4}$. Comp. Alciphron, iII 48,

 die Dionysischen Künstler, 1873, pp. 58-63).]

The common genus or notion which unites $\Delta$ eovvookódakes and texpirat as 'contraries' is that of service to a deity: the rex $\begin{aligned} \text { irat } \\ \text { as well as the }\end{aligned}$ кódakes being assumed as actors, to be devoted to his especial service. The distinction is that between true art, and low buffoonery. This, as far as I can see, is the whole meaning of the passage.

Victorius however, and Schweighäuser on Athen. vi 249 F, drag in here, wholly as I can conceive beside the point, another sense of $\Delta t o-$ ขvookóגakes in which it was applied to the flatterers of Dionysius of Syracuse-of whose filthy and disgusting practices Theophrastus (quoted in Wyttenbach on Plut. p. 53, F) gives some revolting examples-in a double sense, of Dionysus and Dionysius : see their notes for the explanation of this. (It is supposed by them and Mr Shilleto $\mathrm{u} . \mathrm{s}$. to be a joke ; if so, it is of a very frigid description.) Wyttenbach says (note ad Plut. l. c.) "Actores scenici honesto nomine dicebantur oi $\pi \in \rho \grave{l}$ $\Delta$ óóvogov rєұvirat, per contemptum $\Delta$ covvgoкódaкєs": which is no doubt all that is meant here, though he refers to Victorius' note, who makes a great deal more out of it. This special sense of re $\chi$ virat is fully confirmed by another passage of Athen. V 198 в describing a magnificent procession of



##  

occurs also in Diog. Laert. $\mathbf{x} 4.8$, Epicurus called rov̀s $\pi \in \rho \grave{l}$ ח $\lambda$ árova
 translated 'Dionysii assentatores' in Cobet's corrected version, though Dionysius can surely have nothing to do with the matter, any more than here). Here also the word is a term of reproach; and seems by this time to have become proverbial for gross and low flattery: "tanquam assentatores eos, non sodales, insimulans." Victorius. Victorius understands the term, as here used, to express the lowest order of attendants on the stage (parasites of Bacchus), such as the scene-shifters, candle-snuffers, and such like menials of a modern theatre, but another passage of Athen. XI

 occurs in a list of the entertainments which were exhibited in a great marriage-feast given by Alexander after the capture of Darius, taken from a work of Chares, 'the histories of Alexander'. Now whether ' $\phi$ ' ois $\bar{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta$ refers to Alexander's delight at their gifts (neut.) or at themselves (masc.), that is, their acting, in either case their employment could not have been of the mean and degrading character attributed to it by Victorius-in the one case they were too rich, in the other, if they amused him, they must have been actors, or at all events above the degree of menials, though their acting may have been mere grimace and buffoonery.
'And one (to vex and lower them) calls them' (whether this means any 'one' in particular, we do not know) 'parasites of Dionysus (low buffoons), whereas they themselves style themselves artists: and each of these is a metaphor (artist as applied to them is a metaphor, I suppose,


 civa. Eth. Nic. vi 4, 1140 a 7 seq.-and these men produce nothing; their profession is practical, ends in $\pi \rho \hat{a} \xi \iota s$, or action), 'the one for the purpose of (lit. belonging to) blackening (soiling, defaming), the other the contrary'.
 עovat tò дакápıov, 'their bliss is tarnished, sullied, defiled, defaced'. Pherecrates, ap. Meineke, Fr. Comic. Gr. II 352, Pherecr. Fr. Inc. 48, ap. Photium, Suidam, Thomam Magistrum. "Schol. ad Ar. Nub. 97, cis dov-




'And pirates nowadays call themselves purveyors'. So Pistol, in Merry Wives of Windsor, I 3.49, "Convey the wise it call: Steal, foh! a fico for the phrase!"
$\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ ] referring to the early times spoken of by Thucyd., I 5 , when the









 iII 73, and elsewhere.

On the actual порtorai at Athens, see Schneider's note on Arist. Pol.

'And therefore (by the same rule) wrong may be called' error, and error wrong' (both of them kinds of injury or offence; that is here the supposition in dáapravelv; but the one is a crime because it is done with a bad $\pi \rho o a i \rho \epsilon \sigma t s$ or moral purpose, the other a venial offence; ävev $8 \dot{\varepsilon}$
 taking or robbing (on a grand scale)'.
'A phrase like that of Euripides' Telephus, "He lords it over the oar (sways it, like a sceptre, the emblem of royalty), and having on his departure for Mysia" is unbecoming (inappropriate), because ruling, swaying, lording, is too big, pompous, for the value (measure, merits) (of the object described); and so, the disguise (concealment) is not effected (the art or effort becomes apparent, supra, § 5).


 but] as it is by Dindorf, Paet. Sc., Fragm. Eur. Tel. 20, and Wagner,
 àvárocıl takes the genit. and dative, not the accus. кómps âva̧̧ and d̀vá $\sigma \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ ѝ et similia are found elsewhere in Eurip. Helen. 1048, Cyclops [86], and Aesch. Pers. 378. In Aeschylus the pompous phrase is much more characteristic. The cautious and sober Sophocles never employs it.
§ II. 'There is also a fault (which may be committed) in the (composition of, and the sound thence arising of the) syllables of a word if (i.e. if ever, or when) they are not signs or marks (indications, representations) of sweet ôr agreeable voice' (i.e. if, when they are pronounced, or expressed by the voice, they don't produce an agreeable sound; $\phi_{\text {win }}$ is the sound of the voice, or the voice as uttered, and forming words) 'as Dionysius the Brazen calls poetry in his elegies "Calliope's screech," because they are both voices'-and so far his metaphor was right: both terms fall under the same genus, ф$\omega \nu \dot{\eta}$, the met. eioos rpòs sidos-'but his metaphor is a bad one by reason of its unsignificant sounds'.

крavy $\left.{ }^{\prime}\right]$ a screech, scream, any harsh and dissonant sound. крásev,

##  

with which it is connected, expresses the harsh voices of certain animals as the 'croak' of the raven and the frog, and the 'bawling' of a man, all suggestive of disagreeable associations. The 'badness of the meta-
 non-significant voice or sound,' applied, Poet. $\mathbf{x x} \S 5,6,7$, to sounds like syllables, and conjunctions, which signify nothing by themselves, but only in combination with other sounds or words; and opposed to oŋpavtıкaí, sounds which do signify something each by itself, as noun and verb $\S \S 8$, 9 . But these non-significant sounds, which represent discordant and unmeaning cries, are here to be interpreted as expressing also the associations which they suggest, and so крauyn', which suggests all these disagreeable cries and screams, is particularly ill applied as a metaphor to the sweetest of all voices, such as that of a Muse.
'Dionysius the Brazen', so called from having first suggested the use of bronze money at Athens, Athen. Xv 669 D , was a poet and rhetorician, ibid., whose floruit is to be referred to the earlier part of the fifth cent. B. C., judging from a remark in Plut. Nic. c. 5, 526 B, where we are told that there was in Nicias' household a man called Hiero, who claimed to be the son of Dionysius the Brazen. A further account of him is to be found in Smith's Biographical Dictionary, Dionysius no. 16; and a collection of the fragments of his elegies, amounting to seven, in Bergk, Fragm. Lyr. Gr. p. 432 [p. 468, 2nd ed.]. In fragm. 5 there is a still worse specimen of his metaphors preserved, which beats even


[On the Bronze coinage of Athens, see Beule's Monnaies d'Athènes, pp. 73-77. It seems impossible to say with certainty, either when it first came in, or what is the date of the oldest bronze money extant. Leake supposes it probable that it came in soon after the first unsuccessful attempt to introduce it, while Beule thinks that the early extant bronzes are of the age of Alexander. It is certain they were in circulation in the time of Philemon, the Comic poet. See Leake's Numismata Hellenica (European Greece), p. 22. These details are due to Professor Churchill Babington.]

On harshness of sound in composition, see Hermog. $\pi \in \rho \grave{i}$ iठcêv
 class, the ' $\phi^{\prime}$ ' $\dot{\epsilon} a v \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \rho a i$, the harshness arising 'out of themselves' from the disagreeable combination of the letters, ärapлós, 屯̈ $\mu a \rho \pi \tau \in \nu$, E $\gamma \nu a \mu \psi \epsilon$, and such like, are given as examples. In the same treatise Toл. $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\prime}$. c. 4, (II 359), there are some remarks upon the connexion of sounds with pleasant associations, which make the sounds themselves pleasant.
§ 12. 'Further, they must not be far-fetched, but from things kindred (cognate) and of like form must be transferred notions (in the form of words) hitherto nameless in the fashion of names (so as to become new names), any one of which as soon as spoken will be clearly perccived


 кıцойขть

## 


to be near of kin, as in the popular (famous) aenigma, 'I saw man gluing upon man bronze with fire'; for the process was nameless, but both of them are a kind of application (the common genus); and accordingly he (the author of verses) gave the name of 'gluing' to the application of the cupping glass.'

 кaì ék rov̂ ó $\mu \mathrm{oiov}$. Cic. de Or. III 41. 163, Deinde videndum est ne longe simile sit ductum. Syrtem patrimonii, scopulum libentius dixerim; Charybdim bonorum, voraginem potius. Facilius enim ad ea quae visa, quam quae audita, mentis oculi feruntur. Ib. II 63.255, of jokes, in quo, ut ea quae sint frigidiora vitemus-etenim cavendum est ne arcessitum dictum putetur... Quint. vill Proem. 23, sunt optima minime arcessita. Similarly of arguments supra, I 2.12, II 22.3. Top. A 105 a 8.
 ferendi verbi late patet, quem necessitas genuit inopia coacta et angustiis, post autem iucunditas delectatioque celebravit. In fact, to say nothing of others, words which stand for moral and intellectual operations, notions, abstractions, conceptions, are and must be ultimately derived by metaphor from objects of sense : see Locke, who gives a list of them, Essay, Bk. III ch. I. 5, Berkeley, Three Dialogues, Dial. III Vol. I p. 202 (4to. ed.), "most part of the mental operations" (this is saying far too little) "being signified by words borrowed from sensible things; as is plain in the terms, comprehend, reflect, discourse, \&c." Whewell, Nov. Org. Renov. Bk. IV 1, p. 260. Renan, Orig. du Langage, p. 128, seq. Leibnitz, Nouv. Essais sur lentend. hum. III I. 5 (quoted by Renan), Max Müller, Lect. on science of Lang. Ist series, Vol. I p. 377 seq.

The second line of this aenigma, which completes it, is found in Athen. x 452 C, the only author, says Victorius, who gives it entire,
 $\lambda \eta_{\eta}^{\prime}$. It is inserted amongst the aiviरiara, No. VIII in the Anthology, Vol. IV p. 288, Jacobs' ed., and preceded by another on the same subject in four lines. The first line is also quoted, Poet. Xxir 5, Demetr. $\pi \epsilon \rho \mathfrak{e}$ épunveias § 102, (Demetrius recommends that aenigmatical expressions of this kind should be avoided), and Plut. Symp. Sept. Sap. 154 B (Victorius). Harris, Philol. Inq. Pt. II ch. 10, on aenigmas. [On the cupping-instrument referred to in the riddle, compare Juvenal XIv 58 (with Mayor's note), iam pridem caput hoc ventosa cucurbita quaerit.





Bronze specimens about four inches high，found by Pompeii，may be seen in the Museum at Naples．］
＇And in general，from all ingenious，well－constructed，aenigmas good metaphors may be derived ：for all metaphors convey（imply）an aenigma， plainly therefore a metaphor（so borrowed from a good aenigma）must be itself well converted（i．e．a well－selected metaphor）＇．Cicero thought less highly of aenigmas as a source of metaphors；at all events metaphors， accumulated till they become aenigmas，are reprehensible．De Or．III 42．167，est hoc（translatio）magnum ornamentum orationis，in quo obscu－ ritas fugienda est：etenim hoc genere fiunt ea quae dicuntur aenigmata．
$\epsilon \dot{v} \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \nu \in \kappa \pi a t]$ is rendered byं Cicero（according to Victorius）ratioze translata，and quae sumpta ratione est，de Or．III 40．160．tò énteเkès

§ 13．＇And（metaphors should be taken）from things fair and noble
 noun，which can represent some visible or audible object），as Licymnius says，resides either in the sound or the sense（the thing signified），and the ugliness in like manner＇．

When Aristotle wrote rò $\mu \grave{i} \nu$ ，he seems to have intended to introduce rò $\delta \dot{\theta}$ to correspond as the second member of the division，which was afterwards carelessly changed into $\eta$ ．It is surprising however that he never corrected such palpable blunders as these，for which he must have had frequent opportunities．Did he think that they were of no consequence in writing，of which the object was instruction only？He says at any rate，III I．6，that no one pays much attention to style in teaching geometry．
àmò ка入فิv］Cic．de Or．III 41．163，seq．Et quoniam haec vel summa laus est in verbis transferendis ut sensum feriat id quod translatum sit， fugienda omnis turpitudo earum rerum ad quas eorum animos qui audient trahet similitudo．Nolo dici morte Africani castratam esse rem－ publicam；nolo stercus curiae dici Glauciam ：quamvis sit simile，tamen est in utroque deformis cogitatio similitudinis．Quint．，vill 6．14－17， quotes the line of Furius Bibaculus（Hor．Sat．II 5．41），Iuppiter hibernas cana nive conspuit Alpes．

кá入入os $8 \dot{e}$ é óvónazos］Theophrastus，according to Demetrius repl épunveias，\＄\＄173－5（Rhet．Gr．III 300，ed．Spengel），recognised three sources of beauty in words，（ 1 ）the appeal to the sight，the direct sugges－ tion of beautiful objects by the words which are associated with them；（2） to the ear，by the sound of the words themselves；and thirdly dtávoa， by the＇meaning＇or＇sense＇，Licymnius＇oquatעó $\mu \in \nu o \nu$, and Aristotle＇s סuvápet the vis，virtue，force，i．e．significance，its power of suggestion． These are illustrated by Demetrius，l．c．，the first by poóóxpoov，duOo－ фópov xpóas：the second by Kaldíotparos，＇Avvoôy，（the $\lambda \lambda$ and $n$ seem





to have pleased his ear）：and the third by ajpxaios as compared with $\pi a \lambda a t o ́ s$, the former being suggestive of higher and nobler associations ： ol yàp ápXaío ävöpes èvrıuórepor．It seems from this that the distinction between the first and third of these sources of beauty in a word is that the first is the direct suggestion，by word－painting，of a beautiful object of sight，as a rosy cheek or skin ：the third is the remoter sug－ gestion of beauty，by inference from association，as àpaios suggests worth and respect；this form of suggestion has an intellectual character， and is therefore represented by Theophrastus as 8távota．To the direct suggestions of sight in the first class，Aristotle afterwards adds all the other senses－as music to the ear，a well－remembered flavour to the palate，smell to the nose，soft and warm things to the touch．The second of the three，is the actual sound of the word，suggesting nothing

roîs $\psi$ ó 0 ots］There are［as already remarked supra p．12，on I § 9 ， ס̀á入eктos］，three degrees of sound in an ascending scale．The first and lowest is 廿ó申os＇noise＇，such as even inanimate things are capable of when struck．The second is voice，$\phi \omega \nu \eta^{\prime}$ or $\phi \theta_{o ́ z \gamma o s, ~(a s ~ d i s t i n g u i s h e d ~}^{\text {a }}$ from speech，）which is shared by all animals that have a throat．The
 discourse，articulate speech．$\psi$ ó $\phi o s$ as distinguished from $\phi \omega \nu \eta$ í will include all sounds which，though human，do not proceed from the voice and organs of speech ：such as sneezing，coughing，hissing，whistling（ $\pi 0 \pi \pi v \sigma \mu o ́ s$ ）and so on．These particulars are taken from two passages，Ar．Hist．Anim． Iv 9， 535 a 27－b 3，and Dion．de Comp．Verb．c． 14 （p．72，Reiske）． Of sound，$\psi o ́ \phi o s$, in its most general sense，as the object of hearing， see de Anima II 8．De Sens．c．3，init．Ib．c．1， 437 a 10．Hist．An． $11.29,488 a 31$ ，seq．，of the distinctions of animals，in respect of the sounds they make．

What is known of Licymnius，I have collected in Camb．Fourn．of Cl．and Sacred Phil．No．Ix Vol．III pp．255－7．［Plato Phaedrus p．267 C，


＇And again thirdly（a third observation upon metaphors），which solves（furnishes an answer to，serves to refute）the sophistical argument （theory or position）；for it is not true，as Bryson said，that no one ever uses（that there is no such thing as）foul or indecent language，if （if－as the case really is，i．e．since or because）the same thing is signified by saying this or that（by using the broad word or disguising it by a veil of $\left.\dot{v} \pi o \kappa o \rho \iota \sigma \mu_{o}^{\prime}\right)$ ，for this is false：for one term is more properly applied to an object than another（represents it more literally and directly）， and is more assimilated to it，and more nearly akin to it，by setting the





thing more directly before the eyes (and so making it more vivid, striking, and impressive)'.

Of Bryson, I have collected what is known in Camb. Fourn. of Cl. and Sacred Phil. No. v Vol. II pp. 143-6. In this dogma of the impossibility of indecent language he seems to have anticipated the Stoics-see Cicero's famous letter to Paetus on this Stoic libertas loquendi, u.s. p. 144 note. Suo quamque rem nomine appellare was their statement of this 'liberty', to call everything its right and proper name without shame or disguise, to call a spade a spade, to use the language of a Swift or Aristophanes. Aristotle answers Bryson by a simple denial of the fact. It is not true that there is no difference in the use of words in respect of their moral effect upon us; the broad and literal expression presents the abomination much more vividly and impressively to the mind, naked as it were, than the same notion when half hidden from the view by a decent veil which conceals a great deal of its deformity. On this subject of plain speaking, besides Cicero's letter to Paetus (ad Div. IX 22), already referred to, see Cic. de Off. I 35. 128 where the Stoics are again introduced. Cicero takes the moral


 difference between coarse and refined indelicacy). Ar.'s opinion upon the subject is given much more strongly and decidedly, Pol. Iv (viI) 17, 1336

 тоєєิิ бن́veryvs. Perhaps one of the wisest observations the author ever made. Comp. Quint. vi 3.29.
' And besides, it is not under the same conditions and circumstances that it signifies this or that, so that on this ground again we must assume that one (mode of expression) is fairer or fouler than another: for though both of them do express (or signify) beauty and deformity, yet not qua beautiful and deformed (in so far as they are beautiful and the reverse, and in no other respect): or, if the latter also, at all events in different degrees'. These two different effects of ai $\sigma \chi \rho 0 \lambda$ oyia seem to be thus distinguishable. We are first told that the use of the broad word is offensive because it suggests directly and immediately, paints on the mind a vivid picture of the ugly, foul or impure object : nothing is said of any further, indirect, associations connected with it, and the bad effect arises solely from the strength or vividness of the impure or ugly impression. But in the second case the effect of the plain speaking and its associations is contrasted with those that may be produced by softening the term, or employing one which signifies the
 $\mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \overline{\lambda o \nu} \kappa \alpha \dot{l} \hat{\eta} \tau \tau o \nu$.




same thing, but suggests an entirely different and innocent set of assocations. As in the instances given by Tic. in de Off. 1 35. 128 liberis dare operam. Here all the associations which would be at once suggested by the broad, obscene word, are diverted, and another set introduced, connected solely with children, as the result of the intercourse, and perfectly free from all impurity. In the one case it is the mere comparson of strength and intensity that makes the difference, in the other there is a difference of kind. 'The fair term and the foul term it is true mean the same thing, point to the same object, but not in respect of beauty and deformity alone simply and solely ( $n$ ), but besides that, there are associations suggested by which the one may be invested with a moral and the other with an immoral character, either altogether,
 example of these words suggestive of unpleasant associations which are willingly avoided by the well-bred and refined under the name of aioxpo入oyia, is to be found in Plat. Gory. 494 C , where Socrates is made to apologise to Callicles for shocking him by the use of terms such as $\psi \omega \rho a ̂ \nu, \kappa \nu \eta \sigma t a ̂ \nu$.
'These are the sources from which metaphors may be taken; from things beautiful either by the voice (the sound of the word itself when uttered), or by the force or meaning' (what it indirectly suggests : as 8úvarӨat, to have the power, force, virtue, when applied to words, denotes their ' value', in the sense of meaning or signification, see note on I 9.36 ; so $\delta \dot{v} v a \mu \mathrm{~s}$ the subst. may of course be similarly employed), 'or by (i.e. conveyed by) the sight or any other sense'. These terms have been
 from Cid. de Or. III 40.161, Nam ut odor urbanilatis, et mollitudo humanitatis, et murmur maris, et dulcedo orationis, sunt ducta a ceteris sensibus; illa vero oculorum multo acriora, quale ponunt paene in conspectu animi quale cernere et videre non possumus.
' But it is preferable (дıaф'́िєt here, to surpass, excel) to say rose-fingered dawn, rather than purple-fingered, or, still worse, red-fingered.' The latter suggests cooks' hands, or other vulgar associations. The rose on the contrary reminds one of what is agreeable to the sight, and the smell. Add to this from Campbell, Phil. of Rhet., Bk. III ch. I § i, (Vol. II p. 142, and ed.), that the last of the three epithets compared is the vaguest and most general, and therefore the worst: the second better, because more special ; and the first best of all, because the most particular, the red (purple Campbell says) of the rose. He also mentions the gratificaion of the two senses.
§ 14. 'In the epithets also, the application of them may be made (they










may be derived, for application) from what is mean and low (morally bad in this sense), or foul and ugly, or disgraceful (another kind of badness), for instance "matricide", or from what is (nobler and) better, as "a father's avenger "'. The one represents the fair side of Orestes' act, the other its bad aspect. "Locus ex Eur. Oreste 1587, ó $\mu \eta \tau \rho o \phi o ́ v \tau \eta s, ~ \grave{e} \pi i \quad$ фóve $\pi \rho{ }^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$ фóvov inquit Menelaus, Orestem criminans: cui se defendens


On émitera, see Introd. on c. 3. p. 289. Ernesti's Lex. Technologiae Gr.
'And Simonides, when the victor in the mule-race offered him only a small fee, refused to write (the ode on this occasion) on the plea of being offended (shocked) at the notion of "composing an ode on halfasses," but when the other gave him as much as he wanted (as satisfied him), he wrote at once, "All hail, daughters of storm-footed mares" ["Hurrah, for the brood of the storm-footed coursers!"], and yet they were daughters of the asses as well'. Dion., de Comp. Verb. c. 25 (Vol. v 20I, ed. Reiske), quotes a pentameter verse, without the author's name,
 On Simonides' greed of gain and miserly habits, see Aristoph. Pax 697-9.
 the air of a proverbial expression for a miser. Comp. his dictum in in 16.2, on the comparative advantages of money over wisdom. The case of Simonides is referred to by Whately, Rhet. c. III (p. 277, Encycl. Metrop. Enc. of mental philosophy), in illustration of the "employment of metaphors (epithets, not metaphors) either to elevate or degrade a subject," of which he says in the note "a happier instance cannot be found" than this.
§ I5. 'Further the same thing may be effected (as by epithets in the way of elevation or depreciation) by diminutives', lit. 'diminutives are, or amount to, much the same thing as epithets'. As epithets, so diminutives, may be applied to diminish the good or bad of a thing, according as a favourable or unfavourable view is to be taken of it. On vimoкo-
 der Klass. Philologie, I p. 459. It will be seen by the examples quoted in the note referred to, that the term includes much more than mere diminu-




tives, and is extended to the expression of all coaxing, flattering, soothing, endearing phrases; and does not (properly) include expressions of contempt, which is however conveyed by many diminutives. The two terms are therefore by no means co-extensive: Aristotle, who has merely illustrated this form of language by examples of diminutives, has taken them alone as the most distinctive class of words which convey by the termination endearment and contempt. The form of endearment used in extenuation diminishes the bad, the contemptuous employment of them diminishes the good.

There are no less than thirteen varieties of Greek diminutive terminations, which may be found in Matth. Gr. Gr. § 103. Donaldson, Gr. Gr. § 361, 3. f. aa, p. 320, gives only ten. Both of them have omitted a form 'Artekiov, which occurs in Arist. Pax 214, where the Schol. has karaфpovíoces évera. It is to be noted that some of these diminutives in -diov have the l long, though by the ordinary rule it is short. rquizionv, Ar. Nub. 93. ovंбï̀ov, Nicom. Inc. Fr. ap. Meineke, iv. 587. $\sigma \eta \pi \bar{\partial}$ öov,
 Lysistr. 470 . 8iкaot ${ }^{2}$ iìiov, Vesp. 803, and others, ap. Fritzsche ad Arist. Ran. I 301. mopvidiov has the 1 long and short, Arist. Ran. 1301, and Nub. 997. The long ؛ arises from a contraction, so that $\pi$ opvïiov must be, derived from mopvi-itov, and is a diminutive of a diminutive. [Kühner Gr. Gr. § 330.]

On Latin diminutives, Madvig, Lat. Gr. § 182 . "By means of lus, la or lum, and culus, cula or culum, are formed diminutives (nomina diminutiva) which denote littleness, and are often used by way of endearment, commiseration, or to ridicule something insignificant, e.g. hortulus, a little garden, matercula, a (poor) mother, ingeniolum, a little bit of talent."

On English diminutives see a paper by Sir G. C. Lewis, Phil. Mus. 1697 seq. in Marsh's Lect. on the Eng. Lang., Smith's ed. p. 218 ; and Latham's Eng. Lang. c. xv § 337 ; also a paper by J. C. Hare in (Hare and Thirlwall's) Phil. Mus. Vol. I. p. 679. These are in kin, ling, and et, let (from the Norman, French and Italian (E. м. C.), Marsh. Lect. u. s. Lect. xiv. § 6). To which Latham adds ie (Scotch), (lassie, doggie), en (chicken, kitten), et and let, trumpet, lancet, pocket, owlet, brooklet, streamlet ; ock (Grimm), bullock, hillock: paddock, buttock, hummock (Lewis). "The Greek word $\mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \mathbf{i \omega \sigma}$ ts means diminution ; viroóó $\iota \sigma \mu a$ means an endearing expression. Hence we get names for the two kinds of diminutives; viz. the term meiotic for the true diminutives, and the term hypocoristic for the dim. of endearment." Grimm, Deutsche Grammatik, III 664 (ap. Latham). The contemptuous diminutive in English is ling; lordling, bantling, foundling, underling, hireling.
'By diminutive I mean that which diminishes the evil and the good (which belongs to the proper meaning of a word; by the addition of a
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termination), of which Aristophanes' sarcasm in the Babylonians is a specimen, where he substitutes xpvoı8́ápov for रovgiov (this again is
 and עooquártov' (Fritzsche, ap. Meineke l. c., by a very probable conj., reads עопца́тьov, which is certainly much more germane to the matter). 'We must, however, be very careful (in the use of this figure), and be on our guard against exaggeration in both' (in the employment of initera and $\dot{\boldsymbol{v} \pi о к о \rho} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \mu \mathrm{o}$ s). On these diminutives of Aristophanes, Meineke, Fragm. Babyl. Xxx. Fr. Comic. Gr. II. 982, observes: "Usurpasse autem videtur poeta istas verborum formas, ut Gorgiam et qui eius in dicendo artem sectarentur rideret, quemadmodum etiam in Acharnensibus saepissime ista ornamenta orationis vituperat." This explains $\sigma \kappa \omega \dot{\pi} \tau \epsilon \epsilon$.
maparnpeiv] 'to lie in wait for', see on II 6.20. In the word here there is no 'evil purpose' implied. It is rather 'to wait upon', watch for an opportunity.

## CHAP. III.

From the graces and excellences of style we now pass on to some of its defects. These are comprehended under the term $\psi v \chi \rho a$, 'faults of taste', expressions stale and cold, flat, lifeless, opposed to $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \phi a r a$ 'fresh'. The import and origin of this word, as applied to style, are illustrated in Introd. pp. 286, 7. The faults lie mostly in some kind of exaggeration, or turgid and bombastic phraseology, the error of excess. Add to the examples there given, Dem. de Cor. $\oint$ 256, de F. L. § 207,


 the details are omitted, and only one of the examples, the íypòv idpôta in § 3 , is given. There is no doubt a lacuna.
§ I. 'Faults of taste are shewn (are made to appear; arise, grow) in four points of style or language; first in compound words, instances of which are Lycophron's 'many-visaged heaven', his 'vast-topped earth', and his 'narrow-passaged shore'.
 tioned are words compounded of two significant elements, ò ó $\mu a \tau a$ o $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ maivovra, Poet. XXI. 1, 2, i. e. of words which have an independent sense of their own; opposed to such as are only significant in combination with others, as prepositions, conjunctions, particles.
$\pi 0 \lambda \nu \pi \rho o ́ \sigma \omega \pi{ }^{2} \nu$ oủpavóv] "quod plurimam variamque faciem habeat ob sidera ipsa, nisi fallor." Victorius. Compare Plato's famous epigram :

 14, Lyr. Gr. p. 445. [Anthol. Gr. vii 669].
 Greece and knew nothing beyond it, the Earth might well seem to be covered with vast summits.

## 



 Greece. The cliffs come down precipitously to the very edge of the sea (in which there are no tides), leaving but a narrow passage for horseman or foot-passenger. The word is used appropriately enough by the poet Aeschylus, P. V. 729, and Eur. Iph. Aus. 1497; also by Herod. vil 21 f.
[Bless, in his brief notice of Lycophron, die Attische Beredsankeit, II p. 235, while conjecturing that several of the phrases here quoted must have come from a panegyric in glorification of Athens and her heroes, and of Theseus in particular, is led by the Sophist's application of menopop ầờpa to Xerxes in § 2 , to refer ákrì̀ $\sigma \pi e v a n o ́ p o \nu$ to the Hellespont. It would be more reasonable, however, to take the hint supplied by his allysion to Sciron in the same section, and explain it of the narrow path which runs like a cornice along the precipitous sides of the cliffs of Scion on the coast of Megara (Eur. Hippol. 1208, £xeipayos dikrás, Strabo ix


 eu but the cliff and its pathway have since once more become an ákrt) arevorópos, which is described by Leake (Northern Greece, II 414) as 'only practicable by foot-passengers'.]

On Lycophron the Sophist, see Camb. Yours. of Classical and Sacred Phil. No. v, Vol. It. p. 141 seq. Not to be confounded with Lycophron the tragic poet, the author of Cassandra, who lived at Alexandria in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, towards the middle of the third cent. B.C.
'And the name given by Gorgias, "beggar-witted or pauper-witted
 Or perhaps rather one who prostitutes his literature and intellectual accomplishments to flattery and sycophancy to make a living by them, 'making his Muse a beggar.' ["This can hardly mean 'arm an dichterischer Begabung', as Rest and Palm explain. Liddell and Scott give with greater probability "living (or rather starving) by his wits." It might also mean, "one whom poverty inspires" (cui ingeni largitor Venter). Wit and poverty are the hackneyed attributes of the Greek parasite, and in a comic poet the epithet would probably have been thought happy. A similar compound, aroxàásav, is quoted from Phrynichus com. (Meineke, C. G. II p. 582)." Thompson's ed. of the Gorgias, p. 179 note.]
 The objection here is to karevopxjoavras, in which the kara is superfluous. All that Gorgias meant might have been equally well expressed by the simple evopkeiv 'to keep one's oath'; or rather the simple opposition of false and true, which he has exaggerated into two long words. evopkeiv, though itself a compound, seems to be regarded here as a single word. The School. has on this, kail Tò karevopkîgat $\lambda$ éyeraz emil

 $\kappa \alpha i$ " $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \phi$ ó $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \sigma \theta a l$," каì " $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \sigma \phi o ́ \rho o \nu \quad \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \epsilon \theta \omega \grave{\omega} \tau \bar{\nu} \nu$ 入ó ${ }^{\prime} \omega \nu$




 is like expounding 'it is day' into the longer and more pompous phrase 'the sun is above the earth.'
 Alcidamas' phrases, "His soul saturated with wrath, and his face growing the colour of fire" (fire-coloured)'. This, as I have noted in the account of him in Camb. Fourn. of Cl. and Sacred Phil. No. Ix, Vol. III, p. 266, is an exemplification of three of the new figures which Gorgias, his master, had recently introduced into Rhetoric, àvi $\theta_{\epsilon \sigma / s}$,

 пирixpor ['flame-flushed'].
"And "end-fulfilling deemed he would be their zeal", and "end-fulfilling established he the persuasion of his words", and "dark-blue-coloured the sea's foundation". (kváveos is indigo blue, also dark in general)-'for all these have a poetical character arising from (due to) the doubling'.
$\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \sigma \phi$ ópos may be translated by Shakespeare's "thought-executing" fires; but that is poetry [King Lear III. 2.4--reגeoфópos became commoner in later Greek prose, as remarked by Lobeck, Phrynichus, p. 673 (referred to by Vahlen, der Rhetor Alkidamas, p. 491 infra].

An account of Alcidamas will be found in Camb. Fourn. of Cl. and Sacred Phil. No. Ix, Vol. III, pp. 263-8 (omit pp. 264, 5, where the proof of a paradox is unnecessarily undertaken). [See also Vahlen, der Rhetor Alkidamas, pp. 491-528 of Transactions of Vienna Academy, xliII 2, 1863 ; and Blass, die Attische Beredsamkeit, II pp. 317-335.]
§ 2. On the second defect of rhetorical style, $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \lambda \omega \hat{\omega} r \boldsymbol{a}$, see Introd. p. 288.
' Now this is one cause (of $\downarrow v \chi \rho o ́ r \eta s$ ); another is the employment of obscure and unintelligible words. As Lycophron calls Xerxes a "hugeous" man, and Sciron' (the famous robber who gave name to the Scironian rocks; put to death by Theseus, after Hercules the greatest eradicator of nuisances from the land of Attica) 'a "bale" of a man'.
 or those which have gone out of use, obsolete or archaic; or those which belong to a foreign language or dialect. Comp. Julius Caesar's rule, tanquam scopulum fugere inauditum atque insolens verbum (Aulus Gellius I 10).
$\pi \dot{\lambda} \lambda \omega \rho o v]$ This word frequent in Hom. and Hes. under the forms




and once in Eurip. Iph. T., had it seems become obsolete in Arist.'s time. Comp. infra 7 § 11 .
oivyıs àvìp] If $\sigma i v v i s$ stands for the actual robber, $\delta$ IItvoкá $\mu \pi \tau \eta s$, rival and contemporary of Procrustes, and Sciron, all of whom Theseus disposed of, he may be translated a "Turpin-man:" but the word is also used to represent the "incarnation of all mischief and destructive agency" -see Monk on Eur. Hippol. 981, and the authors cited; comp. the old poetical words $\sigma$ iveodal, oivos, ( $\sigma$ ivrns of the great robber and ravager, the mischievous, destructive lion, Hom. Il. XX 165,) and rivis. Both $\sigma$ ivos and rivs occur in Aeschylus in the abstract sense of mischief or destruction, and if oivves is to be so understood here, as I rather think it should, bale, an old English word of similar import, may serve to express it. [Suidas

 phrase is supplied below § 4, "to apply to or introduce toys in poetry". ${ }_{a}^{a} \theta v \rho \mu \alpha$ is a childish amusement, $\dot{d} \theta \dot{v} \rho \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ to sport like a child, of a child's sport or pastime. So employed by Homer, Pindar, Apoll. Rhod., Anthol. (quinquies), Euripides (in his Auge, Fragm. viri Wagner, vi Dindorf) $\nu \eta$ $\pi$ iocs $\dot{\alpha} \theta \dot{v} \rho \mu a \sigma \iota r$, and by Plato in the solemn semi-poetical Leges, vil 796 s. See Donaldson on Pind. Nem. III 44, raîs éàvä ävpé, also Meineke ad Fragm.
 is the corresponding English word; which is actually used by Spenser in the same more general sense of 'a childish sport or amusement,' and in this sense is with us obsolete. Faery Queen, Bk. 1. Cant. 6, 28 "To dally thus with death is no fit toy, Go, find some other play-fellowes, mine own sweet boy." 'Gawd' is another word now obsolete that might represent it.
 draoӨa入iá, àrá $\sigma \theta a \lambda o s, \dot{a} \tau a \sigma \theta a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$, a poetical word denoting 'mad, presumptuous arrogance', found in Homer and Herod., and also in an
 $\theta a \lambda$ inv. ['Retchlessness,' for recklessness, is similarly an unfamiliar word with ourselves, and may serve as an illustration, if not a rendering of this use of $\dot{r} r a \sigma \theta a \lambda i ́ a$.]
 heady, like pure unmixed wine) 'wrath of his mind'. The $\gamma \boldsymbol{\lambda} \omega$ ôta
 exasperated, excited, provoked, irritated; sharpened like a knife or tool, or an animal's teeth. Examples from the tragic poets are supplied by


 Trag. Dind., Eur. Cycl. 240, Electr. 836. Xenophon however has employed it several times; Cyrop. 1 2. 10, 6. 19, 6.41, II 1. 4, 5, 7, Mem. III 3. 7. Lat. acuere. [Vahlen, der Rhetor Alkidamas p. 492, notes that





its repeated use by Xenophon need not prevent us from regarding this use of $\theta \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ in prose as a kind of provincialism; it appears among the
 ảkovạ.]
§ 3. 'The third vice of style lies in the misuse of "epithets", that is, in introducing them either too long, or out of season (out of place, we say), or too frequent (numerous); for in poetry it is suitable enough to say "white milk" (a Homeric epithet of course ; as red wine, fair women, \&c. in ballad poetry), but in prose it is not only less appropriate, but also, if they be employed to satiety (excess), they convict (detect, expose, the art of the composition) and make it plain that it is poetry : for, to be sure, it must be used; for it varies the customary style and gives a foreign air to the language'.

On énitera see Introd. p. 289. The over-long 'epithets' are illustrated by those of Aeschylus in Tragedy, and Aristophanes in Comedy-who

 most inappropriate to prose. The excessive length may also be shewn in the 'descriptive additions' to a substantive, which often takes the place of a regular epithet.

סєî $\boldsymbol{\gamma \in} \chi \rho \eta \bar{\sigma} \theta a \iota a \dot{v} \tau \hat{\eta}]$ i. e. to a limited extent ; taking care at the same time that the poetical character of the language be not marked and apparent (reading av̇rg the vulgata lectio retained by Bekker). Spengel with
 language is far more applicable to poetical usages than to epithets : in
 satisfactory meaning).

' But the mean should always be our aim, for (the reverse of moderation, excess) does more mischief than careless, random, speaking, (over-doing it, exaggeration, is worse than entire carelessness, taking no pains at all) : for the one no doubt wants the good, but the other (has) the bad (the defect in the one case is negative, the mere absence of special excellence, in the other it is positive). And this is why Alcidamas' (epithets) appear tasteless; because he employs them, not as the mere seasoning but as the actual meat (pièce de résistance, the substance, not the mere adjunct or appendage); so frequent, and unduly long ( $\mu$ eí̧ort tov̂ 8 éóvtos, too long) and conspicuous are they'. Victorius is doubtless right in his opinion that these three words are a repetition in slightly altered terms of the three views of epithets at the commencement of the section; unseasonableness, the importunity with which they engross the attention, is now represented by the conspicuousness or








undue prominence which produces the same effect. A fair specimen of this pompous inflated writing, in epithet and metaphor, is given in Auctor. ad Heren. Iv 10.15, nam qui perduellionibus venditat patriam non satis supplicii dederit si praeceps in Neptunias depulsus erit lacunas. Paeniteat igitur istum qui montes belli fabricatus est, campos sustulit pacis.
 parently without due cause, though Vahlen quotes it with approval.]
[The little that is left of Alcidamas seems to justify Aristotle's strictures




 we should surely read ev̇ropias which is a suitable contrast to ätopon and

 thirty-five sections of the rhetorician's diatribe, e. g. § 34 , which is also an instance of the superabundance of epithets here criticised; $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu$
 Alkidamas, u.s. pp. 508-510, and Blass (who has edited Alcidamas, Gorgias, and Antisthenes in the same volume as Antiphon), die Attische Beredsamkeit II 328.]
' For instance, (he says) not 'sweat', but "the moist sweat" ; and not 'to the Isthmian games', but "to the general assembly (great convocation) of the Isthmian games"; and not 'laws', but "laws the kings of cities"; and not 'running', but "with the impulse of his soul at speed"; and not merely 'a Museum, or haunt of the Muses', but "a Museum of all Nature that he had received"; and "sullen-visaged (or sullen-looking, with sullen aspect) the care (solicitude, anxiety) of his soul"; and "artificer" not of 'favour', but " of universal public favour"; and "steward (administrator, dispenser) of the pleasure of the hearers"; and "concealed", not 'with boughs', but "with the boughs of the wood" ; and "he clothed", not 'his body', but "his body's shame"; and "counter-imitative (responsive-answering) the desire of his soul"; and "so extravagant (inordinate, [abnormal]) the excess of the wickedness"'.


 фроутíठа тйs $\psi v \chi \bar{\eta} s$ ，каi ои̉ $\chi \alpha ́ \rho ı \tau о s ~ a ̀ \lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ \pi \alpha \nu \delta \eta ́ \mu о \nu ~$

 $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon ́ \kappa \rho \nu \psi \epsilon \nu$ ，каi ои́ тò $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha$ тарй $\mu \pi \iota \sigma \chi \epsilon \nu \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ $\tau о \hat{v} \sigma \omega ́ \mu \alpha \tau о s ~ \alpha i \sigma \chi u ́ \nu \eta \nu$ ，каi $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu i ́ \mu \iota \mu о \nu \tau \eta ̀ \nu \tau \hat{\eta} s \psi \nu \chi \hat{\eta} s$




 son on Gorg．u．s．］
 literally，and own that I do not fully understand it ：$\pi a \rho a \lambda a \beta \omega \dot{\nu}$ seems suspicious： $\mathrm{A}^{\bullet}$ has $\pi \epsilon \rho\left\llcorner\lambda a \beta \omega^{\prime} \nu\right.$ ，which does not much mend the matter．Per－ haps all the meaning lies on the surface，and there is none underneath． Victorius says that $\mu$ ovecion is locus a musis bonisque artibus frequen－ tatus：and translates，cum naturae museum accepisset：adding，appellat igitur hic quoque $\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{s} \boldsymbol{\phi} \phi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \omega_{s}$ epitheton，cum adponatur illi nomini ad naturam eius explanandam．［Vahlen discusses the phrase in his article on Alcidamas，u．s．，pp．494－6，and suggests that the passage
 таралаßஹ̀̀ $\mu$ оvбєîov，which he translates＂mit der Seele Sturmesdrang den Wissensschatz der Naturum fassend．＂$\mu$ ovacion occurs in a well－known

 ing account of the word may be found in Thompson＇s note．Vahlen，who holds that $\mu$ оvaeía $\lambda_{o ́ j}{ }^{2} y$ there means Redeschulen，in denen man das
 that by rò $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ ф $\dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ rovaciov Alcidamas here intends to express what in ordinary language would have been expressed by some such phrase as ij $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{i} \phi \dot{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{c}$ ioropía．In illustration of this view，he quotes a fragment of Diogenes Laertius，vili 2．56，where＇A入кíauas ì $\boldsymbol{\tau} \Phi \bar{\Phi} \Phi u \sigma i k q$ says of Em－

 Stobaeus，120．3，the quotation of two lines of Theognis ék rov̂＇A入кıס̀＇－ maytos Mourciov shews that as a title of a book（whatever its exact meaning may be）the term is not so modern as might be supposed．（Compare Blass，die Attische Beredsamkeit II 322，note）．］
$\dot{a} \nu \tau i \mu \mu о \nu-\dot{e} \pi \imath \theta v \mu i a \nu] \dot{a} \nu \tau i \mu \iota \mu o s$＇corresponding by，in the way of，imi－ tation＇，as ávтíнорфos＇corresponding in form＇，àvtirvatos＇stroke answering stroke＇，divtiotpoфos of an＇answering wheel＇of a chorus．Aristoph．







From the passage of Aristoph. it seems that this word, like deriotpodos, should have after it a dative of the object to which it answers; what that object was in Alcidamas' declamation Aristotle has not informed us.
'And this is at the same time a compound word and an epithet, so that it becomes quite a poem (a mere bit of poetry : plain prose is turned by this inflated style into poetry).



 Phil. 212-must mean 'out of its proper seat or place', 'abroad'; and hence as an exaggeration of excess, 'extravagant', as translated.

On these extracts from Alcidamas Victorius remarks, "Cum autem haec omnia a mediis quibusdam orationibus sumpserit, ut vitiosae tatum locutions exemplum int, non est quod miremur aut plenam sententiam in nonnullis non esse; aut desiderari, ut in hac, verbum unde casus nominum regantur."
'And so this poetical diction by its unsuitableness introduces absurdity and tastelessness into their composition, and obscurity which is due to the verbiage: for whenever (a speaker or writer) accumulates words (throws a heap of them) upon one already informed (already acquainted with his meaning), he destroys (breaks up, dissolves, effaces) all perspicuity (distinctness) by the cloud (or darkness, obscurity) in which he involves his meaning' (lit. which he brings over it; ėmarkoтeî ron kpíce, II. 7 , see note: to overcloud, over-shadow, obscure).
di8odecxiav] the accumulation of unnecessary or unmeaning words: dionecxia is idle, empty, chatter, prating. It is applied to Socrates and the Sophists by Aristoph. Nub. 1480, 1485, and Eupol. ròv $\pi$ raxòv


 Eth. N. 111 13, $1118 a$ I; de Soph. El. C. 3, $165 b 15$.
$\left.\dot{\epsilon} \pi \kappa \mu \beta{ }^{2} \lambda \lambda_{p}\right]$. "Similiter loculus est Plat. Cratyl. $414 \mathrm{D}, \mathrm{de}$ inculcates

 enim impediunt ne unde ductum id nomen sit videri posit. Idem affirmavis M. Varro, de L. L. multa anim verbal litters commutatis suns interplata." Victorius.
'And people in general, use their compound words (roils, those that they $d o$ use) when it (what they want to express) is nameless (has no single word to represent it) and the word is easily put together (the combination is easily made), as रpovorpıkiiv: but if this be carried too far





（overdone），it（the result）becomes absolutely poetical．And this is why

 for these are noisy，＂full of sound and fury＂；full of pompous，high－ sounding phrases＇（on 廿ódos see III 2．13）；＇and obsolete or unusual，to Epic poets，for language of this kind has a stately（majestic，dignified， proud，solemn，and scornful or disdainful）air；and metaphor to writers in iambics，for these they（i．e．the tragic poets）now－a－days－since they have quitted the tetrameter－employ，as has been already stated．III 1.9 comp．infra 8．4，and Poet．IV 18．The reason，conveyed by $\gamma$ á $\rho$ ，is this： I say iambics，not tetrameters，because now－a－days，\＆c．
 So in Daniel＇s Ulysses and Siren，＂Delicious nymph！suppose there were No honour or report，Yet manliness would scorn to wear The time in idle sport．＂Isocr．Paneg．§41，ìסívtas \＄ıatןıßás．］

On compound words，as connected with dithyrambic poetry，Demetrius，


 roves）：comp．§ 78，the accumulation of metaphors will make 8ı日＇⿱丷天甲a $\mu$ ßov àvгi $\lambda o ́ \gamma o v$.

The dithyramb at Athens became at and after the end of the fifth cent． the wildest，and（in point of style）most licentious and most extravagant of all the kinds of poetry．See note in Introd．on III 9，pp．307，8，and the reff． to Aristoph．there given；Bode，Gesch．der Hell．dichtk．Vol．II．Pt．II． p．III seq．and 290 seq．；and Müller，H．G．L．s．xxx．To use words suited to a dithyrambic poet is therefore an exaggeration of the ordinary defect of the introduction into prose of poetical language．





 ígri kai 8ıOípa $\beta$ Bot，（p． 763 R ）and（ 764 ）where the words of Phaedr． 238 D（u．s．）are quoted．Hor．Od．iv 2．10，of Pindar，per audaces nova dithyrambos verba devolvit，Donaldson，Theatre of Gks．p．37，note 3；and
 ration of language．
 ship ：applied again to the heroic measure or rhythm，III 8.4.

On these passive forms in Greek and Latin，see Donaldson，New






Croat. § 410, Varron. p. 406 (ed. II), 97. Add to the Greek examples given $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu e^{s}$ and é evpyós and to the Latin, somnus (sopio).

кai avีӨad̃es] This means that the unusual $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\text {dom prat }}$ affect an air of independence and hauteur; they, like the avioderivs, the self-pleaser, selfwilled, stubborn, haughty, independent man, will not conform to ordinary usage, and scornfully affect singularity. Comp. Poet. XXiv 9, rob ràp
 каі $\mu$ етафорàs 8е́хетан цá̀ıaта.
§4. 'And further, the fourth vice of style is shewn in metaphors; for metaphors also are inappropriate, some because they are laughablefor the comic poets also employ metaphors others from their exaggeraion of the stately (solemn) and tragic (pompous) style: if far-fetched, they are obscure". $\pi$ of $_{\rho} \rho \omega \theta \in \nu$, see on III 2.12. "As Gorgias, "things (npáy $\mu a \tau a$, actions, occurrences, events, business) all fresh and raw". This certainly is a good exemplification of what it is designed to illustrate: it is obscure. It seems, however, to mean nothing more than 'recent events', events fresh, and with the blood in them: the metaphor from a beast just killed. It therefore corresponds to apóo paros, 'fresh', which also stands for 'recent'. $\pi \rho$ pógфaros is specially applied to 'fresh meat'. See Lobeck On Phrynichus, p. 375, note: examples of mpórфaros are there given, p. 374. "And these things thou hast sown in disgrace, and reaped in misery ". For it smells too much of poetry'. [Both the extracts probably belong to the same context, and may perhaps be combined by rendering them thus: 'all was green and unripe (fresh and flushed with sap), and this was the crop that you sowed in shame to reap in ruin'. $\chi^{\lambda+\omega p i ̀}$ cal Eैvapa possibly refer to the green and unripe stalks of corn, with the sap still fresh in them. This assumes that dina can be used metaphorically of 'sap', both coming under the generic notion of 'vital juice'. If so, the metaphor is a sufficiently bold one. Thompson (ed. of the Gorgias, p. 179) notes that ävoun (which is the reading of $\mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{Y}^{\mathrm{b}}$ and $\mathrm{Z}^{\circ}$ ) is 'well supported, and cannot but be right,' and remarks that while the metaphor of sowing and reaping is a mere commonplace, "pallid and bloodless affairs" would need apology even from a modern.]

A metaphor, nearly resembling the first of these two, occurs in





Hermogenes also, $\pi e \rho \hat{\text { in }}$ Spengel, Rhetores Gratci, vol. II.) gives some examples of exaggerated metaphors, đ̊кvevev
oiov Гoo





 but without the author's name. The objection to some of these metaphors, as the 'sowing and reaping', the 'selling oneself', and above all, Alcidamas' 'mirror of human life', seems to shew a change of taste from ancient to modern criticism. We certainly should object to none of these; and the 'mirror' in particular has become one of the commonest metaphors in our language. The 'sowing and reaping' appears in Plato, Phaedr. 260 C (see Thompson's note), and Aesch. Pers. 82 I. In Cic. de Orat. II 65.26I (without comment), ut sementem feceris ita metes. I Ep. ad Cor. xv. 42-4. Ep. ad Gal. vi. 7 (and Lightfoot ad loc.). "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy: he that now goeth forth weeping, and beareth forth good seed, shall doubtless come again with joy, and bring his sheaves with him," Psalm cxxvi. 6, 7. Possibly the antithesis, one of Gorgias' new inventions, may have helped to offend Aristotle's tastes, and it is the effect of the whole phrase, and not of the harmless metaphor alone, that has unconsciously provoked his disapprobation: yet the same occurs in the simple psalm.
 metaphor from a mirror, in the form of a simile, $\pi \epsilon \rho i=\sigma o \phi i \sigma \tau \omega \nu, \S 32$, eis
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$ f́ádióv $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$. The present passage and those already quoted



 ทंठovis (§3), point with equal probability to a pamphlet on Rhetoric.]
'And as Alcidamas (follower of Gorgias), (called) philosophy a "fortress to threaten" (a standing menace to), the laws; and the Odyssey a "fair mirror of human life"; and "introducing no such toys, or gawds, in his poetry"-for all such things are subversive of credibility, for the reasons already stated'. These are, that forced metaphors, and all such-like artificial graces and ornaments, make the art and the labour of composition apparent ; make the speech appear studied and affected, and therefore premeditated and unreal, and without
 earnest and real conviction, which are required for persuasion, being always simple and natural. Probably the most perfect example of art thus disguised by art is to be found in Mark Antony's speeches over Caesar's body in Fulius Caesar; and the first thing he does is to impress upon his audience the entire artlessness and unstudied simplicity of






his address: I am no orator as Brutus is, but, as you know me all, a plain, blunt man that love my friend, \&c [III 2.221].
$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \tau \in \dot{\chi} \downarrow \sigma \mu a]$ in the first extract from Alcidamas, is interpreted in this passage in the Lexicons of Rost and Palm, and Liddell and Scott-in Stephens' Thesaurus it is quoted but not explained-'a bulwark or defence of the laws'. But $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{\text {miteix }}$ ' $\sigma \mu a$ in its proper literal sense seems to be invariably used of an offensive, not defensive, fortification, to command and annoy an

 as indeed is required by the $\dot{\pi} \pi i$ with which it is compounded; and philosophy may be used in the attack, as well as the defence, of established laws and institutions, whether it be understood as speculation or scientific research.
'And Gorgias' address to the swallow, when she discharged her excrement' [rather, 'dropped her leavings'] upon him as she flew over, is
 shame, Philomel", said he. For to a bird it was no disgrace to have done it, but to a young (unmarried) lady it was. And therefore he was right in his reproach to describe (speak of her as she was, and not as she is'. The simplicity of all this is delightful. I could fancy Aristotle winking to his imaginary reader as he wrote the explanation, öpvi $\theta_{\iota} \mu \dot{\text { è } \nu}$ yáp $\kappa$.r...., a bird, you know, \&c. [The anecdote illustrates the habit of irony ascribed to Gorgias in 7 §11, infra, $\mu \in \tau^{\prime}$ eip $\omega v e i a s$ änep Fopyias èmoiet, as noticed in Thompson's ed. of the Gorgias, p. I80.]
$\pi \in \rho i \pi \tau \omega \mu a]$ in medicine and natural history is 'a secretion'. It occurs constantly all through Ar.'s writings on Nat. Hist. Plut. Symp. p. 727 D (Victorius), in telling the same story, uses the broad Aristophanic word :



On the transformation of Procne and Philomela authorities differ. Thucydides, II 29, referring to the story, seems to adopt Gorgias' view, and make Procne the nightingale. Ovid seems to leave the point unsettled, Metaph. vi 667 seq. But tradition in general, and English poetry in particular, have always associated Philomela with the nightingale ; e.g. 'Less Philomel will deign a song. Milton's Penseroso, 56.

Victorius notices on this passage that Aristotle includes under the designation of metaphor more than is now recognised as belonging to it. The case here, he says, is a mere hypallage or change of name. Comp. Cic. Orator c. xxvir 93, 94. Hanc vimadגayin rhetores, quia quasi summutantur verba pro verbis, $\mu$ нтшvphiav grammatici vocant, quod nomina






transferuntur. Aristoteles autem tralationi et haec ipsa subiungit, et abusionem qualm катáxpךбıv vocant, ut quum minutum dicimus animum pro parvo, et abutimur verbis propinquis, si opus est, vel quod delectat vel quod decet. Comp. Introd., Appendix on Metaphor, pp. 375 and 376.

CHAP. IV.
From metaphors (c. 2), and the abuse of them (c. 3), we pass on in this chapter to the simile, єiкळंv; which differs from the metaphor only in this, that the latter concentrates, or fuses into one, the two things or notions brought into comparison. The former separates them by the particle of comparison as. Thus the simile may be regarded as an expanded metaphor. See further on this in Introd. p. 290, and the references to other authorities.
§ I. 'The simile too is a metaphor, the difference between them being slight : for when he (Homer ${ }^{1}$ ) says of (his, or the great) Achilles " and as a lion he rushed on ", it is a simile, but when, " he rushed on, a (very) lion", a metaphor : for (in the latter) because they are both brave, he transferred to Achilles the appellation of lion'.
§ 2. 'The simile is useful also in prose, but seldom (to be employed), since it has a poetical character. They must be used like metaphors (the same rules must be observed in the use of them as of metaphors); in fact they are metaphors, only with the difference already stated'.

${ }^{1}$ The words here assigned to Homer do not occur in our present text : but the substance of them is found at the beginning of the famous simile of the lion, Il.
 description of this animal. On the quotations from Homer in Aristotle, see Heitz, Vert. Schrift. Arist., die homerischen Fragen, p. 258, seq. : and Paley's note, with the extract from Wolf's Proleg. § II, Untrod. (to the ed. of the Iliad) p. xxxvi. The former of course includes this amongst the quotations which differ from Homer's text, but draws from this the inference that the text used by Aristotle (who himself revised it) was here different to our own. I think that nothing more can fairly be inferred from cases like this than that Aristotle has misquoted the words of our present version: all the substance is there. As we have already so many times had occasion to notice, Ar. has here quoted from memory; and like all other men of very extensive reading and very retentive memory, Bacon for example, and Walter Scott, has trusted too much to his memory, not referred to his author, and consequently misquoted. And I think that is all that can reasonably be said about it.
$\delta \grave{\epsilon} \dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ ai $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha ф о р a i \cdot ~ \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha ф о \rho a i ~ \gamma a ́ \rho ~ \epsilon i \sigma t ~ \delta ı \alpha-~$





to any topic, example, argument, or anything else that is to be 'brought forward'. Supra c. 2. 10, 13 , infra c. 6. 7, also 11 22.16, 17. Top. 日 1, 153 $a 14$, et passim. Isocr. Areopag. $\S 6$.
§3. 'An example of the simile is' (it. Similes are at hing like that simile which), "that which Androtion (directed, discharged) against Idrieus, that he was like the curs when they are let loose (untied) ; for they fly at you and bite, and so Idrieus was vicious (or savage) when he was freed from his chains'.

Androtion was an Athenian orator, whose name occurs coupled with many opprobrious epithets not only in the speech delivered against him (Or. 22), but also in that against Timocrates in which he is very frequently mentioned. He was sent on an embassy with Melanopus and Glaucetes, Dem, c. Timocr. $\S \$ 12,13$, alibi, to Mausolus prince of Caria 377-351 в. c. Idrieus was his brother, and Androtion may have met him at his court, and there had the encounter with him which ended in the discharge of his simile. The Scholiast on Isocr. p. 4627 (ap. Sauppe, Int. Nom. ad Or. Att.) tells us that he was a pupil of Isocrates, and the writer of the 'Atthis', "a work on the history of Attica", Biographical Dictionary -which settles the question raised in that Dictionary about the identity of the orator and author-and the Scholiast adds that he was also the defendant in Demosthenes' speech contra Androtionem.

Idrieus was a prince of Caria who succeeded to the throne on the death of his brother Mausolus in 351 bic. See Mr Bunbury's Art, in Biogr. Dict. He is mentioned by Isocrates. Philippus § ion, as єข̀торш́таrove тढ̂̀ $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \hat{\imath} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \bar{\eta} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho n \nu$. This speech was published in 346 b.c. (Clinton), and therefore subsequent to his accession. It may be presumed that the imprisonment with which Androtion taunts him was due to his brother, and of course prior to his accession to the throne. He is referred to again without his name by Demosth. in the speech de Pace, § 25 , 一 this was also delivered in 346 B.C. (Clinton F. H. II 360) -as 'the Carian', who had been permitted to take possession of the islands of Chios, Cos, and Rhodes. [A. Schaefer, Den. u. s. Zeit, I 351, 440.]
'And Theodamas' comparison of Archidamus to Euxenus - minus his geometry, by proportion: for Euxenus also will be Archidamus plus geonetry' (a geometrical Archidamus). Nothing is known of the three persons here mentioned. Theodamas compares Archidamus to Euxenus without his geometry; and so-by the rule of proportion, i. e. in the same proportion-will Euxenus be to Archidamus with geometry: i. e. equal, both being alike rascals. The proportion is that of equality. With $\dot{\epsilon}^{\prime \nu}$ r $\hat{\varphi}$ ai $\nu a ́ \lambda o \gamma o v$ supply $\lambda o ́ y \varphi$, , in the ratio, or relation, of proportion'.







In this we are referred to the 'proportional metaphor', the last and most approved of the four kinds described in Poet. XXI 7-16. Comp. Rhet. III 10. 7, where the proportional met. is illustrated at length. Victorius, who agrees in this explanation, supplies a parallel case from Diogenes

 comparison and applied it to the equal worthlessness of Archidamus and Euxenus. It was probably a standing joke at Athens. The case may have been something of this kind:-Two contemptible fellows, one of them priding himself upon a little knowledge of geometry, are comparing or disputing their respective merits: "you needn't say any more about the matter," says Theodamas, a bystander, who was listening much amused to the discussion, "you are both equal, Arcades ambo, a pair of fools, only Euxenus is a geometrical Archidamus, Archidamus an ungeometrical Euxenus."
'And that in Plato's Republic ( $\mathbf{V} 469$ D), that "the spoilers of the dead are like curs (kuvidiots, contemptuous, diminutive: an improvement on Plato, who merely says кuшむy), which bite the stones (thrown at them) without attacking, setting upon, the thrower"'. Aristotle, like Bacon, quoting from memory, and assuming a knowledge of the original in his readers, has left out the explanatory part of the illustration which is supplied by Plato. Victorius cites Pacuvius, ap. Nonium, in Armorum Iudicio, Nam canis, quando est percussa lapide, non tam illum appetit, Qui se icit, quam illum eum lapidem, qui ipsa icta est, petit.

кal $\dot{\eta}$ els $\left.\tau \dot{\Delta} \nu \delta \dot{\eta}_{\mu} \mu^{2}\right]$ This, which originally stood in MSS $\mathrm{Q}, \mathrm{Y}^{\mathbf{b}}, \mathrm{Z}^{\mathbf{b}}$,
 by Victorius from MS A:
'And that (simile, understand cikćv,) (directed) against democracy, that it is like a ship-owner (or ship's captain) strong but slightly deaf'. This again is a mere allusion to or reminder of, 'what every one must surely remember', Plato's celebrated illustration (Rep. vi 488 A ) of the evils of democracy by the comparison of it to the undisciplined, untrained, turbulent, anarchical, crew of a ship; each of them, though utterly without qualification for the charge, ready to dispute with the captain the direction and control of the vessel. The passage is referred to by Cicero, de Off. I 25. The words quoted by Ar., few as they are, are not correct: he makes the vav́к $\lambda_{\eta p o s}$ the representative of the $\delta \hat{j} \mu o s$, the whole state; in Plato the थav́r $\lambda \eta$ pos-the ship-owner, who in this case is captain, and steers his own vessel-is the governor, or governors, of the unruly mob of citizens.
'And that (sc. cixas, as before) applied to the poet's measures, that they are like the bloom of youth without beauty (actual beauty of features):

 $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \nu \theta_{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma, \tau \dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \delta \iota \alpha \lambda \nu \theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu \tau \alpha$ ov่ $\chi$ ö $\mu \circ \iota \alpha$


 for they, when their bloom has faded (worn off, when they have lest it), and the other (the poet's measures) when they are broken up, seem utterly unlike (their former selves)'. This also comes from Rep. x 601 b, euke
 örav av̉rà ró ä afos $\pi p o \lambda i \pi \eta$. All poetry is imitation of natural objects, which are invested with certain 'colours' by the poetical art, in which the entire interest and beauty of poetry lie. These colours resemble the bloom on a youthful face, which is merely superficial, when there is nothing corresponding underneath, no beauty of feature or solid attraction. The imitation of the objects themselves may be bad and incorrect, as the face itself may be plain; so that when the bloom, the poetical colours, the graces and ornaments, and especially the numbers, are removed, there remains only a substratum, which may be worthless, of the direct imitation. Horace, Sat. I 4.60 , has pronounced, as is wellknown, a directly contrary opinion, at least in respect of the better kind of poetry. After applying to Lucilius' verses much the same criticism as Plato does to poetry in general, he adds, Non, ut si solvas 'posiquam discordia tetra Belli ferratos postes porlasque refregit,' Intevias etiom disiati membra poitac: from Ennius. Compare Isocr. Evag. § $11, \psi^{4}$




With the expression comp. Eth. N. X $4,1174 b$ ult. olow tois akpaious $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ $\underset{\omega}{\omega} \rho a$, pleasure is like the bloom on the ivépyta, the realized, active energy: illustrated by Zell's note ad loc., from Valerius Paterculus [II 29. 2], of Pompeius, forma excellens, non ea qua flos commendatur actatis, sed ex dignitate constanti. Youthful bloom, distinct from, and independent of, personal beauty.
'And that of Pericles against the Samians, that they are like babies (raioions, "little children") which cry whilst they take the morsel (or sop) offered them'. 廿ojus recurs, under the form $\psi \propto \mu \pi \mu a$, in the third simile following, where it is explained. The comparison made here by Pericles of the Samians to babies, which take their food, but cry while they take it, refers to their conduct after the final reduction of the island by Pericles
 Oqgav ivarop $\mu$ qui. The sop, i.e. the nourishment, benefits, favours, they had received-from the Athenian point of view-consisted, thinks Schrader, in their freedom, and liberation from the yoke of the Persians and the oligarchs. - They nevertheless, though they accepted them, most ungratefully and unreasonably grumbled. Buhle refers to Diodor. XII 27.
'And (of Pericles again) against the Bocotians; that they are like their
 тoùs Bow





own holm-oaks: for as these are cut down (knocked about or down) by themselves' (dashed one against another by the wind; so Victorius; or 'cut down', split by wedges and mallets made of their own wood, like the "struck eagle" of Aeschylus, Waller, and Byron), 'so are the Boeotians, by their civil (or domestic) contentions'.
'And Demosthenes compared the people' (of the Athenian, or some other, democracy: understand eika ${ }^{\prime \prime} \boldsymbol{\prime} \boldsymbol{\nu}$, which is expressed in the next example) 'to the sea-sick passengers in the vessels at sea'. Their squeamishness, fastidiousness, nausea with the existing state of things, constant desire of change, is produced by the perpetual agitation, fluctuation of their political condition and circumstances, the tumultuous waves of the stormy sea of civil commotion : they are sick of the present, and long for change. The Demosthenes here mentioned is, by general consent, not the Orator; more probably the Athenian general of the Peloponnesian war in Thucydides [sine causa, says Spengel].

The very remarkable fact that the name of the great Orator is in all probability only once mentioned by Aristotle-II 24. 8, where Demades' condemnation of his policy is quoted-though the pair were living together for many years in the same city-is parallel to a similar silence of Bacon as to his great contemporary Shakespeare; but still more remarkable in the former case, from the constant occasion offered to the writer on Rhetoric of illustrating his rules and topics from the practice of the first of speakers. It has been already noticed in the Introduction, pp. 45, 46, and notes, where the cases of supposed mention of or allusion to Demosthenes are collected and examined. And this omission will appear still more remarkable when it is contrasted with the nine closely printed columns of references and citations in Spengel's Index Auctorum ad Rhetores Graecos 111 312, seq.
'And Democrates' comparison of the "orators" to the nurses who themselves swallow the morsel (which they have previously chewed and softened for the baby), and smear (or slobber over) the babies with the spittle (that they have used in the process)'. This is the case of the lawyer and the oyster in the caricature; the legal practitioner swallows the savoury contents, and presents the rival claimants with a shell apiece; so the public speakers swallow the substantial profit themselves, and besmear the audience with their unctuous flattery. Comp. Ar. Eq. 715 ,




## 

 öтı $\alpha \pi о \lambda \lambda u ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о s ~ \epsilon u ́ \phi \rho \alpha i ̣ \nu \in \iota . ~ \pi \alpha ́ \sigma \alpha s ~ \gamma \alpha ̀ \rho ~ \tau \alpha u ́ \tau \alpha s ~ к \alpha i ~$ixкivov трıт入áбıov катéбтакаs. Democrates, the author of this saying, seems, from a passage of Plutarch (in Vict.), Pol. Praec. 803 D, to have been notorious for biting and offensive sayings, тò $\lambda \nu \pi q u ̂ \nu$ ákaípos roùs $\dot{\boldsymbol{a}}$ коvouras: two of them are quoted. Two persons of this name are mentioned by the Orators. One, son of Sophilus, of the deme of Phlya, in a list of the ambassadors sent to Philip in 347 B.C., after the fall of Olynthus (in the spurious $\psi \dot{\prime} \phi \iota \sigma \mu a$, Demosth. de Cor. § 29, see Dissen), and again in another questionable $\psi \dot{\eta} \phi \iota \sigma \mu a$, Dem. de Cor. § I87, purporting to be Demosthenes' decree for the appointment of ambassadors to Thebes and the other Greek states, to negotiate an alliance, and arrest the progress of Philip, June, в.c. 338, Clinton, Fasti Hellenici, sub anno.
 Aesch. de F. L. § 17. Nothing more seems to be known of either of them. The two are confounded in the article of Smith's Biographical Dictionary, Democrates No. 1; and the saying here quoted is styled "a fragment of one of his orations."
'And Antisthenes' comparison of Cephisodotus the thin (slight, lean) to frankincense, because he gives pleasure by wasting away'. i $\lambda \epsilon \pi r o{ }^{\prime} s$ seems to have been a sobriquet of Cephisodotus; and may also indicate a second point of resemblance between him and frankincense, namely his slight, vaporous, unsubstantial nature. Buhle quotes in illustration the German proverb, die Fuden nehmen sich nirgend besser aus als am
 ment that was to be got out of him : all the rest of him, his properties, qualities, character, was anything but enjoyable, bad and vicious. On $\lambda \epsilon \pi \tau o ́ s$ contrasted with $\pi a \chi u ́ s$, and men distinguished by this personal peculiarity, Athenaeus has three chapters, XII 75-77, p. 551 , seq.

Antisthenes is most likely the Cynic philosopher, who outlived the battle of Leuctra, 371 B.C., Clinton, Fasti Hellenici, sub anno 365, and was therefore contemporary with Cephisodotus. He, like his successor, Diogenes, had a habit of bitter sarcasm, of which the saying here quoted is a fair specimen. It is truly a bitter jest. See the account of him in Cotton's art. in Smith's Biogr. Dict. Vol. I, p. 208 a. A long list of his sayings is given by Diog. Laert. in his life, VI 1 , some of which are caustic enough. Mr. Grote, in his account of Antisthenes, Plato, III, p. 504, seq., has not specified this cynical feature in his character. [Blass, die Attische Beredsamkeit, II 304-316.]

Cephisodotus, $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa$ Kє $\rho a \mu \epsilon \in \omega \nu$. Distinguished by Sauppe (Ind. Nom. ad Or. Att. III, p. 77) from the general of that name, mentioned by Demosth. c. Aristocr. $\S \S 153,156,163,167$, as sent (about 359 B.c.) to cooperate with Charidemus in the Hellespont and Chersonese, and elsewhere; by Aesch. c. Ctes. § 5 I , seq.; by Suidas and Harpocration. Cephis. ék Kє $\rho a \mu \epsilon \epsilon \omega$, the orator, is referred to in Dem. c. Lept. § 146, together with Leodamas, Aristophon, and Deinias, as one of the best speakers of the
 The Cephisodotus who was sent (with Callias, see note on III 2. 10) to the congress at Sparta in B.C. 371, Xen. Hellen. VI 3. 2, VII I. 12, seems more
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likely to have been the orator than the general ; and so Schneider pronounces, ad Xen. l. c. Three more bons mots of the same are quoted, infra III 10.7. In Mr Elder's art. Cephisodotus No. 2, Biog. Dict., the two are identified. [Arnold Schaefer distinguishes them, Dem. u. s. Zeit III 2. 155-6.]
'For all these may be expressed either as similes or as metaphors : and therefore, plainly, all those that are popular when expressed as metaphors, will be also (if required) similes, and similes metaphors without the descriptive details (the detailed explanation)'. "A simile is a metaphor writ large, with the details filled in; this is $\lambda$ óyos." Introd. p. 290.
§ 4 'The proportional metaphor should always be reciprocally transferable, and to either of the two congeners; for instance, if the goblet is Dionysius' shield, then also the shield may be appropriately called Ares' goblet. Such then are the elements of which the speech (or discourse in general, or prose) is composed'. This section, and its concluding observation, are fully explained in detail in the Introd. pp. 290-292, to which the reader is referred.

Anaxandrides (Meineke, Fragm. Comic. Gr. III. 20I, Anax. Fr. Inc. xxxi.) as well as Antiphanes (Kaivev́s, Meineke, Fragm. III. 58) quote this metaphor of Timotheus in ridicule. From Athenaeus, XI. 502 B , we learn that the goblets which Anaxandrides calls фuá入as "Apeos are tàs napuatás, 'walnut-shaped'. This tends to confirm Twining's remark, on Poet. XXI. 12, note 185, that there was a resemblance in shape between this kind of cup and a shield, which helped to suggest and justify the metaphor. He refers, as also Buhle ad loc. Poet.-see also Gräfenhan, ad Poet. p. 157-to Hom. Il. XXIII 270, on the shape of the ф'á̀ $\eta$, $\pi \epsilon^{\prime} \mu \pi т ф$


I have followed Bekker, ed. 3, and Spengel, in his recent ed. [1867], who agree in excluding from the text the superfluous кaì $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i$, before $\tau \bar{\omega} \boldsymbol{n}$ $\dot{\boldsymbol{o}} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\nu} \omega \hat{\nu}_{2}$-apparently a mere repetition of the preceding кai $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi i$ before $\theta$ áréa.

> СНАР. V.

Here commences the second division of $\lambda \in \xi \in s$, the treatment of style as it appears in the combination of words in sentences, and the connexion of the latter in harmonious periods. The dexí, the beginning, basis or

## 



foundation, of style in this sense, is purity of language, rò ${ }^{E} \mathrm{E} \lambda \lambda \eta \nu i \zeta \in \iota \nu$, pure and correct Greek, in idiom and choice of words, opposed to barbarism, solecism, and all impropriety in general. The subject of Purity has been already treated in the Introduction, under the head of ' General observations on Style,' p. 279, note 3.

The divisions of the chapter, the five heads to which Purity may be reduced - to which are added in the last section two supplementary topics which belong rather to perspicuity, punctuation and $\mu$ ета thesis-are explained and illustrated by references to the works of other rhetoricians, in the analysis, Introd. pp. 292-5.

The classification is, as we shall see, extremely imperfect and deficient ; and, moreover, the distinction of purity and perspicuily is not carefully observed. Most probably Aristotle did not recognise it at all. Nearly all the precepts given in this chapter are referrible to perspicuity rather than purity.
 fundamentum oratoris...locutionem enendatam et Latinam.




 ap. Gaisford). This takes quite a different view of the meaning of the word to that of Aristotle; in the one case the 'purity of the Greek' is shewn in the choice of words, in the other in the connexion of sentences by observance of the idiom of the language. But in fact both of these belong to 'pure Greek': and purity is a negative quality of style, consisting in the
 (1) solecism (Aristotle's view, idiomatic, grammatical, blunders), (2) barbarism; the latter, the use especially of foreign words (whence the name), or any similar impropriety. Atque, ut Latine loquamur, non solum videndum est ut et verba efframus ea quae nemo iure reprehendat, et ea sic et casibus et temporibus et genere et numero conservemus, \&c. Cic. de Orat. Mil il.40. In the next section he includes pronunciation. The
 32,182 a 13 and 34 , are both of them grammatical errors : one who is guilty of either, ovic àp doкoin eג $\lambda$ npi $i$ cev. In the same, c. 3,165 o 20 ,

 eikaraфpóvprov eivat.]
'(Pure, correct) Greek is the foundation of style: this falls under five heads or divisions'.
§ 2. 'The first of these is (the proper use of) connective particles, that is, when they are made to correspond, in such a natural position (relation) of priority or posteriority to one another in the sentence, as some of them





 the apodosis，the one particle necessarily implying the other；and the
 other person，some one else，（see note on I 6．22，and Donaldson，New Cratylus，§ 154，there cited，）correlative and subsequent or posterior：and therefore in the construction of the sentence $\mu^{\prime} \dot{\prime} \nu$ is placed before（ $\pi \rho \sigma_{-}$ тєро⿱亠乂），дє́ after（v̈gтєрор）．
 c．2，p． 37 I seq．；and on its various senses in general，ib．Appendix D， p． 392 ；and again p．437，in the analysis c． 25 （26）of the Rhet．ad Alex． The rule here given for the treatment of connectives is derived originally from Isocrates＇ré $\quad$ Øך．Ibid．pp．437，8．The Rhet．ad Alex．also has


 avr－anododovau（in the following clause）is to do this so that there is a ＇reciprocal correspondence＇between the two，àrr－à $\lambda \boldsymbol{\eta}$＇$\lambda o t s$. ．＇But this reciprocal correspondence between them should be introduced（by the speaker，סeî ròv $\lambda$ éyouta）before the audience has had time to forget
 first of the two connectives，with its accompanying clause；and the two should neither be too widely separated，nor should（another）conjunction be introduced before that which is absolutely required；for（such a construction）is seldom appropriate．＂But I ，as soon as he told me－ for Cleon came entreating and requiring（claiming，demanding）－set out with them in my company．＂For in examples like this，several clauses with conjunctions are prematurely inserted before that which is to correspond as the correlative＇．

The example of this faulty construction here given is one of the very few which Aristotle has manufactured，contrary to his usual rule of citing examples from the sayings or writings of others supplied by memory．This has been noticed as one of the characteristic differences which distinguish Aristotle＇s Rhetoric from the Rhet．ad Alex．－see Introd．p． $414^{1}$－the author of the latter，almost invariably，illustrating his precepts by examples of his own．The example itself，as appears from the то入入oi $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{2} \nu \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu_{0}$ of the ensuing clause，is to be regarded，not as an actual exemplification of the fault，but only as a suggestion of what might be．In itself it is clear enough ：but if these parenthetical clauses be multiplied－as in fact is very often done in Aristotle＇s own writings－ between protasis and apodosis，the hearer，or reader，is very apt to

1 Where＂the single exception，of 111 16＂requires modification：but the ex－ ceptions are extremely rare．








forget the commencement of the sentence, and the argument becomes confused.
'But if the clauses that intervene (before) imopevó $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ (between the
 unfrequently used with only one of the two extremes, between which the intermediate lies, expressed : examples are, Aorist. Acc. 432, Tך $\eta$ र́qou

 in Shilleto's note on Dem. de F. L. § 181, who compares with the last instance, our own twilight, ie. 'betwixt (darkness and) light'. Add Soph. Oed. Col. 583 , $\tau \grave{e} \dot{e} \hat{e} \mu \dot{\mu} \sigma \varphi$. Ib. 291 (with Schneidewin's note). Eur.



A violation of this rule is pointed out by Arnold, on Thus. I 32. I. Comp. Quint. viii 2. 14, 15 . The parenthesis, to $\mu$ efagú, is there called interiectio. Interiectione, qua et oratores et historici frequenter utuntur, ut medio sermone aliquem inserant sensum, impediri solet intellectus, nisi quod interponitur breve est; Virg. George. III 79-83 being adduced as an example. This is properly referred by-Quint. to perspicuitas.
§ 3. 'So one point (or head, of merit in style) appears, resides, in the due construction of connectives (conjunctions); a second is to call things by their own proper (special) names, and not by terms that are general (comprehensive ; i. e. names of classes, abstract terms)'.
 circumlocutions', such as the general definition for the particular object under it, the $\lambda_{\text {of nos }}$ for the üгс ; or a description in several words substituted for the single "ion övopa, as Ibericas herbas for spartum, duratos muria pisces for salsamenta, Quint. vil 2.2,3, and others, quoted by Schrader from Tic. de Div. II 64 . This is $\pi \epsilon \rho i \phi \rho a \sigma \iota s$, a roundabout, not direct, expression of your meaning, circumlocutio, circuitus eloquendi, Quint. viIi 6. 59-6I.

I have followed this explanation myself in the paraphrase, Introd. p. 293; but I now see that the word cannot bear this meaning, and adopt the explanation of Schweighäuser on Athen. vii 309 A (q. v.), who understands by it the $\gamma^{i}$ pos, the genus or class name, which, being an abstract, general term, is of course less perspicuous than the direct expression of one of the particulars, (z ira, of which the class is composed,) by the name of the concrete individual; as animal or man than John




and Thomas. The genus may be said $\pi \epsilon \rho t e x \in \iota \nu$ ' to comprehend, embrace, include', the species, and individuals of which it is made up; and conversely $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \epsilon ́ \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ of the included object, тò ímoкeípevov, Anal. Pr. 127,

 óvó $\mu a \sigma \iota$, which must be carried on to $\pi \epsilon \rho t \in ́ \chi o v \sigma \iota \nu$, can hardly stand for 'descriptions' consisting of many words.
§ 4. 'Thirdly, to avoid ambiguous terms; but that, (viz. to avoid them,) only if the purpose be not the contrary': the contrary, viz. to perspicuity, that is obscurity. If your object is to be obscure, you should then not avoid, but make use of, these equivocal terms, to hide your meaning and mystify your audience.
 $\boldsymbol{\tau} \eta_{\nu} \nu$ 白 $\xi \iota \nu$, 'ambiguity' in words connected in a sentence, 'in the proposition'; distinguished from $\dot{\boldsymbol{\rho}} \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu \nu \mu i a$, ambiguity in single words, de Soph. El. c. 4. It is exemplified, l. c. $166 a 6$ seq. See above, in preliminary observations to II 24. These two last precepts are most probably taken, like the preceding on $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \ell \sigma \mu \mathrm{os}$, from Isocrates' $\tau \in \notin \nu \eta$; and appear also


 to be Aristotle's own. On the various kinds of $\dot{a} \mu \phi i \beta o \lambda i a, ~ a m b i g u i t a s, ~$ in Rhetoric sunt innumerabiles (Quint. vil 9). They may be referred to two general heads; in" singulis verbis (oj $\boldsymbol{j} \omega \nu \nu \mu i a$ ), and coniunctis (Aristotle's $\left.\dot{\alpha} \mu \boldsymbol{\phi} \boldsymbol{\beta} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda_{i}\right)^{\prime}$.
'As is done (ambiguous terms employed, by speakers and writers) whenever, having in fact nothing to say, they make a pretence (affect) of saying something; for such (those who pretend to a meaning when there is none) express this no-meaning in verse (comp. III I. 9, ol motךrai $\lambda$ éyoutes $\epsilon v^{\prime} \theta_{\eta}$ к.r. $\lambda$. .), Empedocles, for instance : for this (roundabout, circuitous, phraseology) circumlocution cheats (deludes) by the multitude (accumulation) of words, and the listeners are affected (i.e. imposed upon) in the same way as the vulgar in the presence of diviners; that is, when (the latter) pronounce their ambiguous utterance; they express their approval by a nod of assent, "Croesus, if he pass the Halys, shall destroy a mighty realm"'.

The oracle leaves it doubtful whether the power or dominion to be destroyed is his own, or some other. Herod. 153, 91. Oracles are proverbially ambiguous and enigmatical. [Macbeth, v 8. 19; Be these juggling fiends no more believed That palter with us in a double sense; That keep the word of promise to our ear; And break it to our hope. Cicero, de Divin. II 56. 116 (to Pyrrhus), Aio te Aaecida Romanos vincere posse.]

Perhaps the two following verses of Empedocles' collected fragments,

 тарауєúovaıv.

## 

Karsten, p. 100, lines 106-7, may in some degree ihustrate Aristotle's allusion to this writer, and his sound without sense ;


Karsten's remarks on Empedocles' style, de Emp. vita et studiis p. 60, (prefixed to the Fragm. and Comment.) well illustrate this passage, to which he refers. He notices the obscurity of his diction, which appears especially in the symbolical terms, such as N $\bar{\eta} \sigma \tau \iota s$, by which he sometimes designates the elements-see for instance the four lines, Fragm. 211-214-and in the ambiguities ascribed to him here by Aristotle, " Nonnunquam vero ad oraculorum gravitatem adsurgit, quales sunt ver-
 $\mu_{0}$ к.r.ג. v. 404. Quamobrem minime miramur quod affirmat Theodoretus, seriores fatidicos ex Empedoclis potissimum versibus oracula sua compilasse."

 $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda_{o \nu} \hat{\eta}^{\pi} \pi o \imath \eta \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$. It is curious to contrast this contemptuous judgment of his poetry and the general character and value of his writings, as it may be gathered from the two passages of the Rhet. and Poet., with the glowing eulogium of Lucretius, de rerum nat. I 716-733. After describing the wonders and good things of Sicily, his birthplace, he concludes, Nil tamen hoc habuisse viro praeclarius in se, nec sanctum magis et mirum carumque videtur. Carmina quin etiam divini pectoris eius vociferantur et exponunt praeclara reperta, ut vix humana videatur stirpe creatus. And still more remarkable is Aristotle's contradiction of himself, if Diogenes Laertius' quotation, viII 57, is to be depended upon, iv
 $\phi \rho a \dot{\sigma} t v$, к.т.入.-comp. the passage of the Poetics:-the possible explanation, that what he said in the one refers to the style, and in the other to the contents, of Empedocles' poem, is excluded by the contemptuous remark upon his style in the Rhetoric. On the passage of Lucretius, see Munro's note, I 733.

Of the vagabond impostors who hawked about spurious oracles and
 diviners and soothsayers, Aristophanes has given us specimens, Hierocles in the 'Peace,' 1252, foll., and the nameless $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu 0 \lambda$ óyos in the ' Birds,' 959, foll.
'And by reason of the less liability to mistake in general (by following this course) diviners are accustomed to deliver their predictions in (through the channel, or medium of) general terms of the fact (which is prophesied), fraus latet in generalibus; for a man is much more likely to make a hit in playing "odd and even" by saying "even" or "odd", than



 тóтє, ठıò oi $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu о \lambda o ́ \gamma o \iota ~ o u ̉ ~ \pi \rho о \sigma о \rho ı ́ \zeta о \nu \tau a l ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \pi o ́ \tau \epsilon . ~$



any particular number that he has in his hand; or "that (the event predieted) will be" than "when" (it will be); and this is why the soothsayers never add (to their prediction) the precise time (lit. the definition of the ' when'). All these then (circumlocutions, ambiguities, and the like) are alike (in being faults) and therefore, unless for some such (reason as was before suggested), to be avoided'.

 account is given in Becker's Charicles, on 'the games', p. 354; and of the corresponding Latin game par impar in Gallus, p. 504. Ludere par iopar, Hor. Sat. II 3.248 (Heindorf's note), Ovid, Nux Eleg. line 79, est etiam, par sit numerus, quid dicat, an impar. The game might be played with any kind of counters, beans, acorns, coins-in Carion's house, after he had grown rich, Arist. Plut. 816, "the servants played at odd and even with golden staters." It is usually described as played by two persons, one of whom held in his closed hand a number of counters, and the other had to guess whether it was odd or even. This was no doubt one way of playing it, but there was also another not quite so simple, as appears from this passage of the Rhetoric, and also from the Schol. on Slut. 1057, in which the guess was made at the number, nóra. In the Plutus, l. c., the game is played with ' walnuts', ká ova, and the Scholiast's comment is, "one grasps a handful of walnuts, and with his hand stretched out asks, how many? and if the other guesses right, he receives all the contents of his hand; if wrong, he pays the number found in the other's hand when opened."
oi $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu 0 \lambda o ́ y o \iota ~ o u ̀ ~ \pi \rho o \sigma o \rho i\} o \nu \tau a \iota ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \pi o ́ r \epsilon] ~ O n ~ t h i s ~ i n t e n t i o n a l ~ i n d e f i-~$ niteness and obscurity of would-be prophets, Victorius refers to Aeschimes c. Cues. § 99, who contrasts Demosthenes with other ad $\lambda$ á§oves, who
 $\chi^{o \nu}$ : and, to the same effect, of a supposed citation from the Sibylline verses, Cid. de Devin. II 54. I Io, Callide enim qua ala composuit perfecit ut, quodcumque accidisset, praedictum videretur, hominum et temporum definition sublata.
§ 5. 'Fourthly, to observe Protagoras' division of the classes (classification) of nouns, into male, female, and inanimate (prop. implements) : for these also must be correctly assigned, each to its proper place'. This is illustrated by an example of two participles in the feminine following $\eta$.


 то́v $\mu \epsilon$."



On the import of this, the earliest attempt at Greek grammar, and other similar essays of Protagoras in the same line, see Camb. mourn. of Cl. and Sacred Phil. No. viI. Vol. III. p. 48 seq. in the article on Protagoras. I have there, and subsequently in a note, Introd. p. 293, endeavoured by comparison of various passages on the subject to determine its meaning, and I need not here repeat what is there said. At all events it is not the now recognised grammatical classification of 'genders of nouns', masculine, feminine and neuter. $\boldsymbol{y}^{\prime} \stackrel{\mathrm{L}}{\mathrm{m} \eta}$ is not here 'genders', though the later grammar adopted this name to express it ; but simply 'classes'. This is a genuine precept of 'Eגдпиוб ${ }^{\circ}$ 's, 'purity of language', as is also the next.
§ 6. 'Fifthly, in the correct expression (by change of termination) of many, few, and one', followed by an example of a plural participle and verb. This is of course the due expression of the number of nouns, and the observation of the concord, or agreement of adj. with subst. or pronoun, or verb with nom. case, in number. Victorius thinks that liza stands for what was afterwards distinguished as the dual number. Comp. Cic. de Orate. III II. 40.
'And, as a general rule, every written composition must be easy to read, or-which is much the same thing-to speak, or deliver'. Comp. Quint. viII 2. 17. Demetr. $\pi \epsilon \rho$ i ep $\eta$ veils, § 193 (Spengel, Rhet. Gr. III 304),

 be carefully and well constructed, with due regard to the conjunctions, and the connexion of sentences, or syntax in general. This is opposed
 of exact connexion-particularly asyndeton, the omission of kai-often aids the effect : comp. § 194.
'This is wanting (in compositions in which) conjunctions and other connecting particles are numerous, and such as are not easy to punctuate, like those of Heraclitus'. This does not contradict what was said before about the necessity of conjunctions, \&c., to ensure perspicuity, it only condemns the excessive use of them; a long string of connected clauses is apt to lead to obscurity : the due mean is to be observed, here as elsewhere. With what follows compare Demetrius, u. s. § 192, to $\delta \grave{e}$ ácúvderov









Quintilian, viI 9.7, classes this as one of the varieties of amphibolia (ambiguity), viz. per collectionem, ubi dubium est quid quo referri oporteat, exemplifying it from Virgil, Aen. I 477 lora tenens tamen. §8, unde controversia illa, Testamento quidann iussit poni statuam auream hastam tenentem. Quaeritur, statua hastam tenens aurea esse debeat, an hasta esse aurea in statua alterius materiae?-бкoretvá, in the above passages of Demetrius and Theon, is of course an allusion to Heraclitus' well-known sobriquet, $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ okoretvós; his 'obscurity' was proverbial. This want of punctuation is not by any means the only, or indeed the principal, source of the obscurity of the mystic enigmatical sayings of the 'dark' philosopher. The remains of these have been collected by Schleiermacher, Bernays [and Bywater] in their respective tracts, and several of the most remarkable quoted by Thompson in his note on Butler's Lect. on Anc. Phil. 1 313, note 10 ; see also Diog. Laert. ix I, vita Heracliti.
dacrikal] dà $\sigma$ ri̧ctv, ('to prick'), is 'to distinguish or duly distribute by pointing or punctuation'. Two examples similar to this are given in de Soph. El. c. 4, 166 a 36 , in illustration of the fallacy of draipects.
' For to punctuate Heraclitus' writing is a hard matter (a difficult job, a business), owing to the uncertainty as to which of the two (words), the preceding or following, (any particular word) is attached ; as for instance, at the commencement of his (av̀rov̂, masc.) composition, where he says,
 into being devoid of understanding"; for this leaves it uncertain to which of the two (éovos or ásuerol yiyvourau) the word ever should be attached by the punctuation'. Bekker, who in his first edition reads tov déovos, has in the third altered it to roid İovtos. Spengel retains the former-which is the reading of ms $\mathrm{A}^{\mathrm{c}}$ (or A). roîd cóvros, which had been already proposed by Victorius from a passage of Sext. Empir., is undoubtedly right. The words are quoted also by Clemens Alex. Strom. v 14, p. 716, by Eusebius, Praep. Evang. xili, and by Sextus Empiricus adv. Math. vii 132, who extracts several lines, reading toûठe ėóvros, and omitting det, which are cited and commented on by Schleiermacher in his tract on the fragments of Heraclitus, No. 47, p. 482. Clemens and
 and this is confirmed by Heraclitus' context, which he quotes-is the universal reason, $\dot{\delta} \theta$ éios $\lambda$ óyos, of which men are unconscious, depending

 'H $\mathbf{\rho a ́ к \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \tau o s . ~ T h i s ~ i n t e r p r e t a t i o n ~ o f ~ c o u r s e ~ r e q u i r e s ~ e ̈ o v r o s . ~ A n ~ a d d i t i o n a l ~}$ argument in its favour is suggested by Schleiermacher, that if déóvos had been the reading in Aristotle's copy of Heraclitus, he would have found no difficulty in the reference of áci. The title of his $\sigma$ 'irypapua-which is omitted by Diogenes in his life, ix I, though the $\sigma^{\prime} \gamma^{\prime} \rho a \mu \mu a$ itself is twice mentioned, $\S \S 6,7$, and some of its contents quoted in the 7 th and follow-




 ing sections-seems to have been $\pi \in \rho i$ ф $\dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \omega s$; the ordinary title of works upon similar subjects by the earlier cosmical speculators, as Empedocles, Anaxagoras, \& c.
äpyou] of something hard, difficult of execution, laborious-in the
 sionally in various Greek writers, though it is exemplified by only one instance in Liddell and Scott's Lexicon. It is used sometimes with,

 in the fragments of the Comic poets, Menander, Diphilus, Posidippus,

 to Meineke's Fragm. Comic. Gr. s. v. Xen. Mem. Iv 7. 9, ̈́pyov eivat eipeiv


 Aristotle, and is, I think, almost confined to the later of the classical






 a 24, c. 10, 1171 a 5, and Top. z 1, 13b9, épywdécrefov. In Latin we have negotium similarly employed, and nullo negotio; and Virgil has opus; Hoc opus, hic labor est, Aen. vi 129.
 He (and Spengel) has now returned to the vulgata lectio daarisal, subaudi $\delta e i$. Gaisford conjectured $\begin{aligned} & \text { ei } \\ & \text { daagrigal. }\end{aligned}$
§ 7. 'And further a solecism is made if, in combining (two words) in one phrase (and grammatically connected with a third; as two substs. with one verb, or two verbs with a subst.), you fail to assign one which is equally appropriate to them both (lit. and again, a solecism is made, by not assigning, that is, if you don't unite in construction with them, i. e. with the two verbs or nouns, which are not expressed, one which is appropriate to them both : in other words, if you do assign to them a third word which is appropriate only to one of them). For instance, to see is not common to sound and colour (won't combine with, is not appropriate to, both) but to perceive is '.
 on $p$. 55].






$\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \zeta \epsilon v \gamma \nu \dot{v} v a t$ ，which occurs again c． 6 §5，and c． 9 § 7 ，seems to be technical in this grammatical application，of＇uniting＇as it were＇under a vinculum or bracket＇；the yoke in the Greek fulfilling a similar function in uniting two animals，as a bracket，in arithmetic or algebra，unites two
 place the Suyóv upon the two words，and so bring them together in one construction．This solecism，as Ar．rightly calls it，usually passes under the respectable name of a figure，grammatical or rhetorical．It is the figure $\zeta \epsilon \bar{j} \gamma \mu a$ or $\sigma \dot{v} \lambda \lambda \eta \psi \iota s$ ，the office of which has been already explained． It is illustrated at length in the note on I 4．6．
$\psi o ́ \phi o \nu$ and $\chi \rho \omega \bar{\omega} \mu$ are＇governed＇by is $\omega \dot{\nu}$ following．Why Aristotle should have chosen to write $\eta$ 开 the alternative，instead of kai the copula， which he clearly means，no one I suppose can guess．I have taken for granted，as Victorius has also done，that he does mean and，and not or， and have so translated it．A bad instance of کev̂y $\mu a$ is given in note I ， Introd．p．295，from the immaculate Isocrates，Paneg．§ 80 （kail $\sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon s$

＇It tends to obscurity too（is an offence against，violation of，perspicuity） if you intend to introduce a number（of words or details）in the middle of a sentence，not to complete the sense first（ $\pi \rho \rho^{\prime}$ ，before you proceed， lit．not to put first，that which will remove what would else be the obscu－ rity）．For instance，＂I intended，after having talked to him about this and that and so and so＂－here the details are to be introduced；but these are so long，that before the speaker has come to the end of his sentence the hearers have forgotten the beginning－＂to start：＂instead of，＂I was about to start after my conversation with him，and then（when） this and that and so and so happened．＂This is $\mu \in \tau a \xi v \lambda o y i a, ~ i n t e r i e c t i o ~$ （Quint．），or Parenthesis．See Introd．p． 295.

## CHAP．VI．

Of oै ofoos（swelling），pomp，grandeur，dignity（Auct．ad Heren．IV 13．18， dignitas），of style；most appropriate to Epic poetry：Poet．xxiv．9，



 has a chapter，$\pi \epsilon \rho i \quad i \delta \epsilon \omega \bar{\nu}, ~ т о \mu . a^{\prime}$ ．（Spengel，Rhet．Gr．II．287），and $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$
 $\mu_{\epsilon} \gamma^{\prime}$ Oous，in the preceding chap．10，p．286．So Demetrius writes $\pi \epsilon \rho \mathbf{~}$




 270 seq.): and Dion. Hal., de Dinarch. Iud. 3. 7, attributes $\mu \epsilon \gamma а \lambda о \pi \rho \notin \pi \epsilon є a$ to Demosthenes' style. And in these writers ö $\gamma \kappa 0$, $\mu^{\prime} \dot{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \theta o s$, and $\dot{a} \xi i \omega \mu \dot{a}$ (dignity) are often associated as characteristics of style. In Top. $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ r, 155 b 22, $\hat{\eta}$ cis ö öкov roû lóyov (one of the four motives for multiplying ípoóárets), it means nothing more than a device for swelling out, increasing the bulk of, the discourse or argument.

In the language of Rhetoric we see that oैyoos implies excellence and is a virtue of style. In the vulgar usage of common life, when it and its derivatives are applied metaphorically, as they often are, it may bear either a favourable or an unfavourable interpretation. In the latter case the 'pomp' of style becomes 'pomposity', and the 'swelling phrases' turgid and inflated ampullae. And in a moral sense the same notion of fastus is attached to it, and it comes to denote vanity, ostentation, arro gance, as Plat. Meno 90 A , where it is personal, and opposed to кó $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \mu \mathrm{os}$.
 versation without 'bulk', not unnaturally and unreasonably swelled out or lengthened. óg ${ }^{\circ} \omega \theta_{i}$ is $\chi^{\lambda} \iota \delta \hat{g}$ in the same author (Fragm. Inc. ap. Stobaeum, No. 679, Dind.) has the same sense in a moral application. And so z̈yкov aúpetv, Soph. Aj. 129. tò óyкทюóv, Ar. Eth. N. IV. 13, sub finem, is again 'inflated', of mere bulk without solidity, show without substance; i. e. morally, 'ostentation', a pretentious air and exterior, assump-

§ I. 'To dignity, amplification of style, the following things contribute ; first, the substitution of definition (or detailed description) for the (direct, proper) name (of the object); to say for example not circle, but "a plane figure which is in all points equidistant from the centre'". One would have supposed that this was an exemplification rather of the unfavourable sense of öykos: it also seems to be opposed to what was said
 ought not to interfere with perspicuity. The two precepts, however, do not in reality contradict one another. The use of abstract, general terms, instead of the plain and direct individual names, is a source of obscurity: there is no obscurity, but rather the contrary, in setting forth the definition of it at length. 'For (the purpose of) brevity the contrary (is the rule), the proper name, and not the definition'. Both of these precepts appear in the Rhet. ad Alex. c. $22(23) \$ \$ 3$ and 5 . They are probably taken, like the others mentioned in Introd. pp. 437, 438, from Isocrates' T'́Xレण.
§ 2. 'And if (you have to express) anything ugly or foul' (to the eye or to the mind and moral sense), 'or unbecoming, if the foulness or indecency is in the (conception, explanation, description, i.e.) meaning and associations, use the word, if in the word itself, the description'. See on aloxpodoyia, note on c. 2. 13, and the distinction there laid down.





入imévas єis 'A $\chi$ аїкоús
$\kappa \alpha i$

## 

§ 3. 'And setting forth (representing) things by metaphors and the descriptive and ornamental epithets (epithets proper, and any descriptive addition to a noun), guarding at the same time against giving them a too poetical character'. One of the characteristics of Thucydides is rò motrrı-
 of Gorgias and his school, who exaggerated this defect so that their prose made a near approach to dithyrambics.
§4 'And to make one many (to put plural for singular) after the manner of the poets: they say, though all the while there is only one harbour, "to Achaean harbours". [Victorius refers to the treatise $\pi$ перl

 writer illustrates by quoting Soph. Oed. Rex 1403-7, ¿ yámol yápot к......]
$\lambda_{\text {céévas eis' }}$ 'A aiikoús] There are five instances of $\lambda_{c} \mu$ éves for a single harbour in Euripides, and one in Sophocles, but none of them is 'Achaean harbours'. Victorius says that he has not been able to find the passage.
'And again, "Here are the many-leaved folds of the tablets", the letter, namely, which Iphigenia was proposing to send by one of the two strangers to Orestes at Argos. Iph. Taur. 727.
 describes the many leaves of the tablets: this, which was less usual than the simpler form, with only two leaves, shews that it was a long letter.

On dedios, comp. Becker's Charicles, p. 162 note [Vol. 1. p. 285, of unabridged German ed.], Rich's Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Ant. s. v. cera p. 144. The leaves of the tablets, which were thin slabs or plates of wood coated with wax, were sometimes shaped like doors (a very natural form to give them), whence the name Gúpa. Pollux IV 18 (ap. Herm. ad Iph.


 [rpintuxoy?] Paley, ad loc., well compares the deגtos with its wooden leaves to 'the modern ivory memorandum-book'. Becker, u.s., observes that 'these wax tablets were only used for letters, and matters of no permanent moment'. They could be fastened with a string and sealed, Paley on Iph. Aul. 37.
daarruxai is interpreted by the Lexicons as equivalent to $\pi$ roxai, and meaning 'folds'-not of course, though the difference is not stated, folded like a modern letter, of paper, which this explanation sug-





gests, but in another sense of $\pi$ rux' or $\pi$ rivg, 'a leaf, layer, slab,
 mentators, who are totally silent on the subject, appear to take the same view. As it seems necessary to assign some meaning to the dia, we may suppose that it expresses the division of the leaves, whether two or more; but in the latter case, derived from the primary division into twe. Hermann and Paley have both noticed, what is sufficiently apparent, that Aristotle here has mistaken Euripides' meaning. It is quite plain from the epithet $\pi$ odiovpot, that the plural is to be understood literally of the several leaves of the tablets. If Euripides had written $\boldsymbol{\delta} \lambda$ лros he would have used the licence ascribed to him by Aristotle.



 ours"'. But if conciseness be the object (if you would express yourself

§ 6. 'And to use (as a rule) in speaking (and writing) conjunctions and other connectives; or, for conciseness, to write without connectives,
 $\delta_{\text {Ienéx }} \theta_{\eta \nu \prime \text { '. It is impossible to translate this into English, so as to shew }}$ the difference in the two Greek phrases, because the approved translation of the second is to convert the participle, which we seldom use in this connexion, into a finite verb connected by a copula with the verb succeeding: so that in our lafnguage the two expressions become identical.
áróvderos $\lambda$ dóyos is composition in which the conjunctions and other connecting particles, especially the copula, are omitted; and therefore more or less loose, unconnected, incoherent. Ernesti, Lex. Techn. Gr. p. 45. It is to be observed that as connecting particles occur much more frequently in Greek than in our own language, the want of them, which constitutes dsyndeton, would be much more disagreeable to the Greeks than to us, and would give the composition the appearance of being both naked and disjointed. Consequently the general rule (which is stated here) is to avoid it : but in special cases, where the aim is to give emphasis and vigour, rapidity and conciseness to a narrative, it may often be used with advantage, as the examples will shew. Demetrius $\pi$ epi ipplicias, § 192,

doivderon is defined alike in several of the later Greek rhetoricians, Hermogenes, $\pi \epsilon \rho l$ $\mu$ e $\theta$ ódov detvórทros, ir, Phoebammon, Tiberius, Herodian, Zonaeus and others, as the 'omission of $\sigma \dot{v} \delta \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \mu o c$ '; and all alike exemplify it by the omission of $\kappa \pi i$, which is no doubt the most frequent




case. Comp. Cid. Orate. xxxix 135, who speaks of it as one of the orationis lumina et quodammodo insignia, gum demptis coniunctionibus dissolute plura dicuntur. Quint. IX 3. 50, figuram, quad qua coniunctionibus caret dissolution vocatur; apta gum quid instantius dicimus; nam et singula inculcantur et quasi pleura fount, seq. Confer omnino

 tosthenes and Andocides both conclude with an asyndeton of this kind.
 Bare' éxere, дıxá̧ece : which Aristotle quotes Rhet. III 19.6, at the end of the work; and of course wrongly. See also III 12.2 and 4 , where a similar example is given ; not to omit Cicero's, abiit excessit, evasit, erupt [in Catilinam II § I]. Demetrius $\pi \epsilon \rho \mathrm{i}$ í $\rho \mu \eta \nu \mathrm{c}$ ias, § 194 (Spengel, Rhet. Gr. III



The meaning of § 6 is this. If you wish to add pomp and dignity to your style, as in an ordinary narrative, employ conjunctionsVictorius refers this to the so-called figure iv dad dvoiv, hendiadys, pateris libamus et auro, in brevia et Syrtes, molemque et montes insuper altos imposuit, from Virgil's George. and Aen.-Or, if you don't employ conjunctions, at any rate don't break the connexion between the parts of the sentence; if on the other hand (as he implies elsewhere) you want to be concise or give vigour and animation to your language, asyndeton will often do it.
§ 7. 'And the (practice) of Antimachus is useful (for this purpose), to draw the materials of a description from the attributes, (qualities, irtues, excellences,) which (the thing described) has not, as he does in the case of Teumessus, "There is a windy low hill"; for in that way the amplification may be carried to infinity'. This is a quotation from Antimachus' Thebäis, the expedition of Adrastus and his six Argive
 sion to mention Teumessus, "a village of Boeotia in the plain of Thebes, standing upon a low rocky hill of the same name". Launching out, as his manner was, into an episodical encomium of this little hill, he expended many verses upon it $\delta$ ia $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \omega \bar{\nu} \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tilde{\omega} \nu$, "enumerating all the virtues that did not belong to it". Strabo, IX. 2, Boeotia, p. 409. Strabo, like Aristotle, only quotes these five words, adding, as a reason
 by Horace, A. P. 146, Dec reditum Diomedis ab interitu Meleagri; a narrative of Diomedes' fortune and return seems to have been interwoven with the main subject of the poem. Düntzer, Epic. Gr. Fragm. p. 99، (The fragments of Antimachus are collected by Düntzer in this volume, p. 99 seq. and Nachtrag pp. 38-43.)

The Scholiast Porphyrion, on the verse of Horace, says, Antimachus fit cyclicus poeta: hic adgressus est materiam, guam sic extendit ut


viginti quattuor volumina（i．e．books）impleverit antequam septem duces usque ad Thebas perduceret．On the connexion of the two stories， see Welcker Ep．Cyclus，p．163；also quoted by Orelli ad loc．Anti－ machus was an elder contemporary of Plato．The occasion of their meeting is related by Plutarch，Lysand．18，and differently by Cicero， Brutus 51 § 191，Antimachuın，Clarium poetam，．．．qui quum convocatis auditoribus legeret eis magnum illud quod novistis volumen suum（the Thebais），et eum legentem omnes praeter Platonem reliquissent，Legam， inquit，nihilominus：Plato enim mihi umts instar est omnium millium． （Welcker pronounces both forms of the story unworthy of credit．）In magnum Cicero no doubt refers not to the merit or celebrity，but to the bulk of the poem．His style is spoken of by Dianysius de Comp． Verb．c． 22 （v．150，ed．Reiske），together with that of Empedocles，Pindar， Aeschylus，Thucydides and Antiphon，as belonging to the avjornpa $\lambda i \xi i s$ ，already described．To class him with these authors may seem to imply approbation．Quintilian，X I．53，in a comparison of the Epic poets，places him next to－though far below－Homer．Contra in Anti－ macho vis et gravitas et minime vulgare eloquendi genus（this agrees with Dionysius）habet laudem．Sed queamvis ei secundas fere gramma－ ticorum（of Alexandria）consensus deferat；et affectibus et iucunditate et dispositione et omwino arte deficitur，ut plane manifesto appareut quanto sit aliud proximum esse，aliud secundum：（so Horace of Jupiter，nec viget quicquam simile aut secundum；proximos illi tamen occupavit Pallas honores）．He is called by some authors Clarian，by others Colo－ phonian．Claros was a small town near Colophon，a colony and de－ pendency of it．Most probably Claros was his birthplace，for which the more important and neighbouring mother－city was substituted．See further on Antimachus in Schrader and Buhle＇s notes；and on Teu－ messus，Valken．ad Phoen． 1107.
［ $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\xi} \dot{\nu} \mu \dot{\eta} \ddot{\epsilon} \chi \epsilon \epsilon$ ．This device of description by a series of negations may

 There are some striking instances in an expanded Anglo－Saxon para－ phrase by Cynewulf of Lactantius＇poem de Phoenice，And there nor rain nor snow，nor breath of frost，Nor blast of fire，nor rush of rattling hail， Nor fall of rime nor scorching heat of sun，Nor lasting cold nor drought nor winter－shower．．．（This translation is due to the Rev．W．W．Skeat）．］
＇This mode of treatment，that the things are not there，（or that the object of praise or censure has them not，）may be applied to things either good or bad（to bad things in a panegyric，to good as virtues， accomplishments，merits of all kinds，in a censure or invective），in which－ ever of the two ways it may be serviceable（or，whichever of the two the occasion may require）．Hence（from the absence of a certain quality or attribute）the poets also derive their epithets（ ${ }^{\circ} \nu 0 \mu a$ here stands for an


 форais $\lambda \epsilon \gamma o ́ \mu \in \nu o \nu ~ \tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ a ́ v a ́ \lambda o \gamma o v, ~ o i ̂ o \nu ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \phi a ́ v a l ~ \tau \grave{\nu} \nu$

such as a stringless or lyreless music＇－music，but without the ordinary accompaniment or instrument，the strings of the lyre，or the lyre itself ： applied to the sound of the wind－instrument，the trumpet－＇for they apply privative epithets；this being popular when expressed in the meta－ phors of proportion，as when the（sound or music of the）trumpet is called a lyreless music＇．

 of opposition ：Categ．c．10， $11 b 17$ and $12 a 26$ seq．

цетафорaís．．．тais ává入oyov］áväخoyov in this combination seems to be
 infra c． 7 § 10，roîs àvà入oyov．On the proportional metaphor，the best of all the four kinds，I have already referred（on III 4．4）to the Introd． pp．290－292．See also Appendix B Bk．III on Metaphor，where this is fully explained．


 $\boldsymbol{a}^{\lambda} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ äo七ov（Victorius＇emendatio palmaria for the vulgata lectio à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ olvov）．

I transcribe Twining＇s excellent note on this passage，which well illus－ trates our present subject．Note 189，p．446．＂Metaphors from their nature are in danger of being obscure or forced，though it is essential to their beauty and effect that they should be clear and apposite．For this purpose a metaphor may be guarded in various ways．If the simple substitution of the improper for the proper term would be obscure or harsh，the metaphor may be converted into an image or comparison

 for perspicuity－that is，if the meaning be not sufficiently pointed out by the manner or circumstances in which the expression is introduced－
 the proper word itself．There is a fine instance of this negative mode of explaining a metaphor in Isaiah li．21，＇Thou drunken，but not with wine．＇The same end is often answered by an epithet affirming of the thing expressed some quality of the thing signified；thus ships are floating bulwarks［Mason＇s Ode to the Naval Officers］，and the lyre a chorded shell，where Dryden［Song for St Cecilia＇s Day，line 17，Fubal struck the chorded shell，］has made the same use of the affirmative epithet chorded that Theognis did of the negative $\mathbf{a}_{\text {Xopdos }}$ in his meta－

 explanatory epithet is itself a metaphor；as in the $\pi$ repwtois dippart （Iph．Aul．251）of Euripides，＇winged chariots＇．Here we have a double metaphor ：ckariot for skip，and wing for sail．＂



He then concludes with four examples of these privative explanatory epithets from the Greek Tragedians，which I have already quoted with some others in the Introduction p．297，in the note on this passage of the Rhetoric．Add to these Cephisodotus＇＇parti－coloured millstones＇， $\mu v ं \lambda \omega \nu a s$ пoukidous，III 10．7，by which he meant to represent the＇crushing＇ properties of the Athenian＇triremes＇in devastating the coasts and islands and exacting tribute．These differ from millstones in having their sides gaily painted in various colours．äntepos фátes，Aesch．Agam．


 poet，Guarini，called birds＇winged lyres＇．］

It remains to notice the proportion of the metaphor，which，according to Victorius，is Trumpet ：sound of trumpet（anonymous）：：lyre ：$\mu$ enos， the music of the lyre（properly so called）．To qualify the harshness， throw light on the obscurity，of this improper application of the word $\mu$ л $\lambda_{o s,}$ the epithet ä $\lambda_{\nu \rho o \nu}$＂not that of the lyre＂is added．

One more remark on privative epithet，which has not been pointed out．They have two uses，the one to qualify，the other to contradict，the substantive they are joined with．In the latter case they are not meta－ phors at all．This is what is called the figure oxymoron，which combines in one expression two contradictory notions of which the one denies the



 sapientia，strenua inertia．

## CHAP．VII．

On the general subject，and the connexion of the several parts of this Chapter on Propriety，see the Introduction，pp．297－303，where they are treated in full．

The passages of Cicero and Quintilian in which the same subject is dealt with are referred to in p．298：and p． 299 has a note（ 1 ），with

$\delta$ 1．＇Style will have propriety，if it be made to express feeling（the various emotions）and character，and be proportionate to the subject－ matter＇．The perverse transition from the feminine to the abstract neuter dvá入oyov（sc．прâyua，as in triste lupus stabulis et sim．）is characteristic of Aristotle＇s carelessness in writing．Perhaps，however，it may be used ad－ verbially as in c． 6 § 7 （see note）．
§ 2．＇This proportion consists in a style of composition（ $\lambda$ ér $\quad$ rat of speaking and writing）such as is neither off－hand（i．e．careless and slo－ venly，av่roкáß8a入os is＇extemporaneous＇）on a dignified，nor stately on a slight and mean（lit．cheap），subject，and has no ornamental epithets （inĝ̀ refers to $\mathbf{i n i} \theta e r a)$ attached to mean words ；otherwise，it（the compo－ sition）has the appearance of mere comedy（i．e．laughable；its subject



is rò $\gamma \in \lambda \lambda^{\lambda}$ î́s ：Poet．v．I，2），like Cleophon＇s poetry（tragic poetry ：he was a tragedian）：for some things that he wrote（said）were like saying（like as though one were to say），＂Lady fig＂，or＂august fig＂＇．

On propriety in this sense，the adaptation of language to the subject or matter of the speech，spoken or written，comp．Hor．Ars Poet． 86 seq．， Cic．de Or．III 55．212，ut figuram orationis．．．ad id quod agemus accom－ modatam deligamus，seq．Orator Xxi 70，seq．Quam enim indecoruin est dè stiticidrìs quum apud unum iudicem dicas，amplissimis verbis et locis uti communibus，de maiestate populi Romani summisse et subtiliter！ §72．Quint．vIII 3．II，Illud observatione dignius，quod hic ipse hones－ tus ornatus pro materiae genere decet variatus，et seq．Clara illa atque sublimia plerumque materiae modo cernenda．Quod alibi magnificum， tumidum alibibi．Ët qùae humilia circa res magnas，apta circa minores videntur．§ 18.
cvórocov］here refers to the ${ }^{\circ}$ ykos or dignity of style，as applied in c．6．1．Elsewhere，as Meteor．Iv 2．6，it is to be interpreted literally of
 equivalent to a preceding $\pi a \chi$ v́repa．Similarly Eur．Syleus，Fragm． 2 sq．
 said of Hercules，whom Mercury is selling to Syleus，and like an auc－ tioneer，setting forth all his excellences ：several more examples are to be found in Rost and Palm＇s Lex．The ordinary meaning of the word seems to be＇of fair，or reasonable，size＇．
 fin．cap．It is said to be derived from кáßos（ill－kneaded meal or dough， （Hebr．Kab，translated $\kappa$ áßos in LXX ；Rost and Palm＇s Lex．s．v．кáßos）．

 Poet．IV 7，aúrooxedıaotik ${ }^{\prime}$ ，of tragedy and comedy in their infancy， whilst still＇extemporaneous＇，ib．§ 14．avitoкáß8a入ot－Semus of Delos， ap．Athen．xiv 16， 622 b－improvisatori．Rost and Palm＇s Lex．inter－ prets this eine art posscureisser aus dem stegreif，and Liddell and Scott sim．buffoons，buffo－actors．But Athenaeus says of them $\sigma \chi \epsilon ́ \neq \eta \nu$ émépauvov ppiocts，which is exactly equivalent to aủreoxedia̧ov．So oxedia is＇a raft＇，a vessel extemporised，constructed on the spur of the moment to meet a sudden occasion．And the whole family of these words seems to derive the notion of hasty，off－hand，unpremeditated，unartistic，action or
 rather ${ }^{*} \chi \in \sigma \theta a t$ ，in the sense of seizing or grasping the first materials that come to hand for a sudden and unforeseen emergency．
aùrokaß8á入os in Lucian，Lexiph．§ io（ed．Hemsterh．II 336），is inter－ preted，qui farinam ipsi sibi subigunt：with the note，aùroкáß8a入ov ä入єv－







${ }^{1}$ ap sine uncinis.
кó $\sigma \mu o s]$ This is mentioned as one of the kinds (eï̀ $)$ of poetical and

 is therefore a poetical or ornamental word. ämav $8 \dot{e}$ ह̀vopá écrav $\dot{\eta}$ kúpoov
 4. All these are defined seriatim except kó $\mu$ нos. Twining, in his note on § 17, argues from this that Aristotle could not have intentionally omitted this alone, and that the explanation of kó $\sigma \mu$ os is one of the many lacunae which had to be supplied in Aristotle's MSS, one of the daßpójara-the moth- and worm-eaten passages, as Strabo calls them in his celebrated account of the transmission of Aristotle's manuscripts (xiil. i). In the Paris MS, indeed, there is a mark of omission which Buhle and Hermann have indicated in their editions. He understands kó $\boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{0}$ s to signify "such an epithet as embellishes or elevates the thing to which it is applied." Though he quotes this passage of the Rhetoric, he does not notice that $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \hat{j}$ here applied to it proves that the kind of ornament intended by кóvرos is an ornamental epithet. See also Gräfenhan, on Poet. XXI 17, p. 159 and on XXIV 9, p. 189, where toî èmi $\theta$ érots кó $\sigma \mu$ ots is quoted from Dionysius de admirabili vi dicendi in Demosthene c. i, (vi 955. 12, ed. Reiske) and again, de Thuc. Iud. c. 23, p. 8642.

 Suidas. He is omitted in Wagner's collection, Fragm. Trag. Gr. vol. III. We learn from Poet. II 5, that his subjects and characters were neither above nor below the level of ordinary, every-day, life and character. To the same effect it is stated in Poet. xxil I, that his style was low or humble, ratetví, and devoid of all poetical ornament. Gräfenhan, ad loc. II 5. Id. ad Poet. xxil I, "qui humili dictione imitabatur vulgares mores."

To Suidas' list of 10 tragedies must be added the Mavópóßovios, de
 is quoted in illustration of a mode of argument.
ce elietev âl That ad, which Bekker puts in brackets, may be retained and justified with el and the optative, will be seen by referring to the Appendix (D) on al dúvarr' äv II 20.5 [Vol. II p. 336].
 honour, equivalent to $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \pi$ oıva, implying reverence and high station, 'august'. It is best rendered by 'Lady'. It has two forms, mórva and ло́rva-í $\sigma i a$, пótva $\theta \epsilon \omega \bar{\nu}$, Eur. Bacch. 370-and in both the ă is short, and can therefore be elided. There is a good article on the word in Lidden and Scott's Lex. which will supply further information.
§ 3. . 'Emotion is expressed, if insult (wanton outrage) (be what yoy



are describing），by the language of one in anger；if impiety or anything foul or base，by that of indignation and reluctance（hesitation）even to name（or mention）it ；what is praiseworthy，by that of admiration；what is pitiable，in a low．tone and language，and so on for the rest in like



àyaبévoos］as in Plat．Phaedo 89 A，＇approvingly，admiringly，with
 inєedígaro．The word is rare，and the meaning here has been doubted． Victorius，cum laetitia，＇with delight or exultation＇．Ruhnken ad Tim． p．9，omnibus perpensis，inclines to the opinion that in Aristotle（that is， here：in Plato，it has the other meaning，）it signifies admirabiliter，mag－ nifice，＇admirably，so as to be admired＇；which seems to me the least likely of the three．

тãeเขผิs］seems to combine Horace＇s dolet sermone pedestri（A．P．95） of the language，with Cicero＇s summissa voce［Orator § 56］of the tone of voice：a low tone in expressing pity is appropriate to both．
§ 4．＇This appropriate language（proper or peculiar to the emotion to be represented）also gives a plausible air to the facts（or statements under consideration）：for the mind draws a false inference to the truth of the speaker（the reality of his emotion，and hence to the truth of his statements），because every one under similar circumstances feels the same－so that they（the audience）are led to think，even though the fact is really not so，that the things（the facts of the case，the things under consideration）are as the speaker represents them（av̉rà è $\chi \subset \iota \nu \quad{ }_{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{i}$ ，Buhle）， and（besides this）the listener always has a fellow－feeling with one who speaks with emotion，even though what he says is naught（worthless； proves nothing）＇．
oiкeia］comp．infra § 7，övópara oiкeía т
тара入оуiऽeтая к．т．入．］The fallacy is this．A speaker puts himself into a passion in describing some atrocity imputed to his opponent，assuming the tone of anger or virtuous indignation，which would naturally be provoked by the act as described．People always sympathize with the expression of emotion，and the audience，knowing what it is to be angry themselves，and perceiving by reference to their own experience the＇appropriateness＇of the language，tone，and gestures，to the true expression of the passion，draw from this the fallacious inference that the speaker must be in earnest，as they were when they were similarly affected，and therefore that the facts that he states must be true：arguing from the truth of the delineation to the truth of the fact stated．

The logic of the fallacy is explained in de Soph．El．c．5， 16761 seq． It proceeds from the false assumption，in antecedent and consequent， that they are reciprocally convertible ：that if a consequent always follows an antecedent the converse is likewise true，and that the consequent in－






variably implies the antecedent as well as the antecedent the consequent. Here, the language \&c. used is the ordinary sign of the emotion represented, as they themselves know from their own experience; and does usually arise in men as a consequence of such facts as those alleged : the antecedent is then falsely inferred 'reciprocally' from the ordinary, but not necessary or universal, consequent. This may be otherwise represented as a confusion between the oŋpeiov, the usual and ordinary, and the
 thereby signified. Comp. Poet. xxiv 18, Їтı дѐ roîto пара入оуıбнós.

 with the language of our text, infra $\pi a \rho a \lambda о$ оiלетаu $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu \eta \eta \psi v \chi \dot{\eta}$. Twining in his note on the passage of the Poet., at the end of n. 222, p. 488 [II p. 352, ed. 2], has quoted and translated this sentence of the Rhetoric.
§ 5. 'And this is the reason why many (speakers) try to stun (overwhelm, confound) their hearers with the clamour that they raise'. The speaker carries, that is, his סeiverts or exaggeration even to the excess of mere empty noise and clamour, thinking thereby to produce a deeper impression upon the audience, who will suppose that the depth and sincerity of his feeling are in proportion to the noise he makes. The dtó is, because the listener always sympathizes with the language and raised tone of passion ; the more violent the expression of it, the more he is likely to be affected. Thuc. vir 42 has кarán $\lambda \eta \xi s$ to describe the 'consternation', abattement de coeur, of the Syracusans at the arrival of Demosthenes and Eurymedon.
§ 6. 'And this mode of proof arising out of (external) signs (exhibited in language, tone, and action) may be invested also with an ethical character, in that (in so far as) that which is appropriate (i. e. the appropriate language, \&c.) to each class and moral state (i. e. character, $\overline{7} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0}$; the sum of the moral states and habits which characterizes the individual) is attendant upon each of them'. The datives $\gamma\left(\hat{\nu} \in \epsilon\right.$ and $\xi_{\xi \in i}$ seem to belong equally to $\dot{\alpha} \kappa o \lambda o v \theta \epsilon \hat{i}$ and $\dot{\alpha} \rho \mu \dot{o}$ ттovea. Compare, with what is said here of $\bar{\xi} \xi \mathrm{ts}$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\theta o s}$, III 16.9 .

In the Introduction, p. 108 foll., on $\bar{j} \theta \mathrm{os}$, I have endeavoured to shew (against Spengel) that there are three kinds of $\bar{\eta} \theta \eta$ distinguished by Aristotle in the Rhetoric; ( 1 ) the $\bar{\eta} \theta o s$ ì $\tau \hat{\varphi} \lambda^{\prime}$ éover, the persanal character exhibited by the speaker himself, serving as a kind of proof of his sincerity, competency, and good will ; (2) the characters of certain




 ages and classes, with which the speaker must be previously acquainted, in order to accommodate his general tone, and the opinions he expresses, to the tastes and dispositions of his audience, their political sentiments and such like : as for instance an audience of rich and poor, young and old, aristocratic and democratical, must be addressed each in a different tone and with different language, suitable to their several opinions and prejudices; and (3) what I have called the dramatic characters, which are treated only in the third book as belonging to style, and are still more important, and occupy a larger share of attention in poetry (especially dramatic poetry)-and therefore in the Poetics xv-than in the prose of Rhetoric. These consist in the accurate representation of personal character, as described by Horace, A. P. 114 seq. See also the instances given in the parallel passage, III 16.9, above referred to. This is what is now called 'keeping', and seems to me to be totally distinct from the second, which refers to classes; although the two have some points in common. The principal differences between them are that the latter describes personal peculiarities, and is an ingredient of propriety of style: and the two are therefore treated in different parts of the work. The dramatic $\eta$ Bos, morata oratio, does however in some inferior degree assist the argument, as Aristote has just told us, and is
 the speaker, and the truth of his description.
'By class I mean (according to age, different ages) the various ages of life, youth, manhood, old age; and (sexes) woman or man, and (natives of different countries) Lacedaemonian or Thessalian; and by states (moral states) those by which the character (or quality) of a man's life is determined : for it is not every kind of state that determines the character of men's lives'. 'E $\xi$ ss, an acquired, developed, permanent, habit, is a general term (opposed to diádects an incomplete and progressive state, Categ.) and applicable to various states in men and things, physical as well as intellectual and moral. It is only the last two that determine the $\eta$ $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ os.
§ 7. 'If therefore (the speaker) use the words (language) also appropriate' (oikeios, domestic: hence properly belonging to, things of one's own : hence special, appropriate, \&c) 'to the (given) state, he will produce this character (i. e. convey it to his speech) : for the clown' (rustic, boor: àpooikos, country-bred, opposed to à $\sigma$ teios, city-bred, polished, as urbanus to rusticus) 'would not use the same language nor in the same way (sc. the same tone, pronunciation, action), as the educated gentle-
 and its opposite dypook'a, 'rusticity, boorishness'; the contrasted 'conversational virtue and vice', of Eth. Nic. II 7, and Iv I4. Comp. Poet.



 $\kappa \alpha i$ oi ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda о \iota \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \epsilon s$.




${ }^{1} \pi \rho о \epsilon \pi เ \pi \lambda \eta \boldsymbol{\eta}^{1} \tau \epsilon เ \nu$

 àpرórто⿱

What follows is a note suggested by the preceding remarks upon the $\pi a 0 \eta \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \xi \iota s$, and not very closely connected with the immediate subject of 'propriety'.
'The hearers are affected also in some degree (some impression is also made upon the audience) by what (a trick which) the speech-writers employ to a nauseous excess; (the introduction viz. of such phrases as) "Who doesn't know ?" "Everybody knows." For the listener is shamed into an admission (of the fact) that he may be supposed to share (what is assumed to be) the feeling of "everybody else".

On $\lambda$ oyoypáфot, the paid writers of speeches for the use of plaintiff or defendant in the law-courts, a much-despised class, see note on II II.7. Victorius supposes, in accordance with his preconceived opinion of a still continued hostility between Aristotle and Isocrates, that the latter is here alluded to ; quoting four instances of it from Isocrates and two from Demosth. de Cor. This is hardly enough to sustain the charge. On this subject, see Introd. p. 4I, foll.
§ 8. Of propriety in the use of every rónos and every ornament of style. 'The seasonable and unseasonable', fitness in regard to time, place, occasion, 'is common alike to all the kinds'. This observation is thought by Victorius to be suggested by the 'nauseous excess' of the preceding section.
§9. 'A remedy for every excess (exaggeration in style) is the notorious practice of speakers: a speaker, that is, should pronounce censure on himself beforehand (in anticipation of the possible disapprobation of the audience): for (then, the exaggeration) is thought to be sound and right since the speaker himself is quite aware of what he is doing'.

The reading of all mSS is $\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \pi เ \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \tau \tau \epsilon!$, which the staunch Bekker and Spengel, the consistent adherent of A or $\mathrm{A}^{\circ}$, both retain. Nevertheless, the emendation $\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \pi \iota \pi \lambda \lambda_{\eta} \tau \tau \epsilon \iota$ makes excellent sense, and its rival is decidedly inferior; and a passage of Quintilian, vili 3.37, which seems to have been copied from this of Aristotle and repeats his words, has (in the Greek words) $\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \pi เ \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu \boldsymbol{\tau}_{\hat{\eta}} \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \beta \circ \lambda \hat{\eta}$, and a little above, prae-muniendum, which also seems to be a reminiscence of $\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \pi \iota \pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$; Spalding (ad loc. Quint.) and Gesner approve, and Casaubon had




already suggested this emendation, and Stephens introduced it in his Lexicon. Supported by this evidence, and the common-sense view of the case, I venture to read $\pi \rho \sigma \in \pi เ \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$. The passage of Quintilian above referred to runs thus:-Et si quid periculosius finxisse videbimur, quibusdam remediis praemuniendum est, ut ita dicam; si licet dicere; quodam modo; permittite mihi sic uti. Quod idem etiam in iis quae licentius translata erunt proderit, quae non tuto dici possunt. In quo non falli iudicium nostrum solicitudine ipsa manifestum est. Qua de re Graecum illud elegantissimum est, quo praecipitur, $\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \pi \iota \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu$ (sic) $\boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\eta} \boldsymbol{i} \pi \epsilon \rho \beta \circ \lambda \hat{\eta}$. And again § 50 , sed hoc quoque

 the way of reprehension of oneself"-so Vater;-which certainly gives a fair sense.
 comp. also Hor. Ep. I 7.98, Metiri se quemque suo modulo et pede verum est. Ib. Ep. I 12.23. Liv. II 48, III 40.
§ 10. The greatest care and pains are always requisite to give the speech an artless, natural, and unstudied character: the rule ars est celare artem is of the utmost importance in effecting the end and object of a speech, persuasion or conviction. See, for instance, III 2.4, 5; 8. r. This applies equally to proportion, as an element of propriety. It has been laid down that a certain proportion (or resemblance) of style, tone, and manner to the subject is always to be observed: but this, if carried too far, will defeat its own object; the study will appear, and the suspicions of the hearers will be aroused. For instance, there is a proportion in the tone of voice and manner of delivery, in the expression of features and the action, to the subject of the words delivered : these however should not be all employed at once : if the words have a harsh sound- $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \rho a ̀$
 p. 236, II 300 (Rhet. Gr. Spengel), by à
 of them objectionable on this ground, occur together. "The voice and the features and the rest should not be made to assume a harsh expression, else the study becomes apparent-it will give the composition a stiff and studied appearance, make it look affected and overdone: whereas, if one or two of them are made to correspond, and the rest not, the same effect is produced, whilst the artifice escapes detection". Introd. pp. 301, 2. Compare on this subject, Cic. de Or. III 57.216.
'Further, not to employ all these proportions (or correspondences) together; for by the observance of this precept (following this rule) the listener is deluded (i.e. the art is disguised). I mean, to take an instance if the words used are harsh (in sound), not to (extend the harshness) to




the tone of voice and the features and the other appropriate (correspondences or proportions)': (we must supply here either $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a s$ from
 or something else similar). 'Otherwise the true character of each of them (their studied and artificial character, $\pi \in ́ \pi \lambda a \sigma \theta a t ~ s u p r a ~ 2.4) ~ b e c o m e s ~$ manifest'.

Vahlen, in his observations on the Rhetoric, Trans. Vienn. Acad. p. 144 (already referred to), says, that nothing else can be implied in rois ápmórrovat than the adaptation of voice and feature to subject, already specified; and therefore proposes to strike out кai before roís ápнórrougıv so that roís ápuórrovaıv may be connected with, not distinguished from, the two preceding. This seems to me quite unnecessary. Besides the two proportions specified by Aristotle, there is at all events vinópeots, appropriate action or gesticulation, that may be brought into correspondence; and also the mode of delivery may be distinguished-at all events for the nonce-from the other three. And he adds a similar objection to another perfectly innocent kai, in 115.28 , кai ws oviros к.r. $\lambda$., the sense (as I have explained it in the paraphrase of the Introduction) being at least equally good with, as without, the conjunction.

In the succeeding clause-which guards against a possible misapprehension of the foregoing, as though it were meant that all this kind of adaptation should be avoided, and intimates that the mean is to be observed here as everywhere else; that we do not rash into the opposite extreme, like those who dum vitant stulti vitia in contraria currunt-the connexion of thought might seem to require that dàv $\delta \dot{e}$ and eàv oùv should change places. If the two clauses, dèp dé, éàv oủv, are to be connected in sense, we require some kind of opposition, expressed by a restrictive or adversative particle such as $\mu$ évrot, $\delta \dot{\delta}$, or ${ }^{\mathbf{d}} \lambda \lambda \lambda \dot{a}^{\prime}$, to establish this, and not one that conveys an inference or consequence, which does not follow from the foregoing.
'But if (the speaker introduce) one and omit the other (make the adaptation in some cases, in others not), he does the same thing (really has recourse to study and art) and yet escapes detection. So then', (it results in a general way from all this,) or, 'well then-as I say-if things soft and mild (for instance, the expression of compassion) be represented by a harsh tone and language, or harsh things in soft tone and language (so Victorius), it (the expression or things expressed) loses all its plausibility (or power of persuasion)'. If ouvy be retained, it must be understood (I think) as I have rendered it. There will be no connexion between the clause which it introduces and that which immediately precedes it, and oűy will be a mere continuative, as in the narrative use of $\mu \dot{\mu} \nu$ oiv-the inferential, as with our then, having degenerated into a temporal sense, denoting mere continuation or succession. The clause will then be a sort



of general conclusion from all that has been said in this section on the adaptation of delivery to subject-matter. aimiAavov, see III 3.4 .
§ II. 'Compound words, epithets' (including descriptive additions of more than one word) 'more than one (several), and strange (foreign, unusual) words, are most appropriate to the language of emotion : an angry man may be forgiven (excused) for saying a wrong heaven-high, or for calling it colossal'. I have translated kaköp 'wrong', on the supposition that the speaker is a complainant in a court of justice, and that the 'evil' at which he is so indignant is some injustice or zurong done to him by the defendant, against whom he is inveighing.
 Comp. III 3.2, where $\pi$ ancopos (the alternative form) is cited as an instance of a $\gamma \lambda \bar{\omega} \boldsymbol{\tau} \tau a$, an antiquated or barbarous term that requires explanation. Isocrates, $\pi \in \rho$ l àvriठörews § 134 , has used the former
 'your success they will exalt as high as heaven'. Aristophanes has it as an epithet of $\phi \omega v^{\eta}$, Nub. 357 , and again of $\kappa \lambda$ éos, 459 , in a chorus. Herod., in. 138, of excessively tall trees, and so Hom., Od. v. 239, of a pine. Aesch., Agam. 92, of the beacon-light, in the mápodos of the chorus.
 hyperbole, or any excess or extravagance, is said to be most used by men in anger, and is illustrated by two quotations from Homer. Also.
 (vehemence), quotes a number of instánces of this exaggerated language and long compound words from Demosthenes when he was affecting
 the whole of the speech against Aristogeiton," he says, "is a specimen of this vehement language": and then proceeds to illustrate it from his other writings: [the speeches against Aristogeiton are, however, undoubtedly spurious.]
'And also (this kind of language may be used) when (the speaker) has fairly' (lit. already, by this time, then and not till then : on this use of $\bar{\eta} \neq \eta$, of ${ }^{*} \pi \omega$, oviкétr, see note on 1 1.7) 'overmastered (got into his power) his audience, and worked them up into a fit (raised them to the height) of enthusiasm, either by praise or blame or indignation, or love (which he has assumed towards them); as Isocrates also (as well as


This is, as usual, a misquotation; Isocrates wrote, Paneg. § 186, $\phi \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu 8 \mathbf{e}$ кai $\mu \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$ (Aristotle ought not to have forgotten this, for it is a striking case of onoootìevtov, or rhyming termination, one of the new figures introduced into Rhetoric by Gorgias and his school): ф $\eta^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$ עè каіे

 written sentence.





 tence): for men (in general) give utterance to such language in their enthusiasm (the language of inspiration), and therefore (the audience) also being themselves in a similar state of feeling (having been brought thereto by the orator) are plainly ready to accept and approve of it'.
[It is worth noticing that ër $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma a \nu$, 'in that they brooked to \&c.', is characteristic of poetic usage, and is rare in Attic prose: though found
 responding prose form is éró $\lambda \mu \eta \sigma a \nu$, which indeed is the manuscript reading in Isocrates l.c. and is corrected by the editors from the present passage and Dionysius Halic. de adm. vi dicendi in Dem. c. 40.]
ë ${ }^{\prime}$ n] Comp. Ernesti, Lex. Techn. Gr. s.v. "rov̀s àkpoarás, auditores occupatos tenere, obsedisse oratione. Ar. Rhet. III 7, ubi permutat cum $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ ìvovatával, extra se rapere." [Cicero, Orator \$ 210, id autem (numerosa oratio) tum valet cum is qui audit ab oratore iam obsessus est ac tenetur;
 auribus inflammare rem coepit; furere apud sanos et quasi inter sobrios bacchari vinolentus videtur.]

The careless introduction of the superfluous $\tau \in$ after $\phi \theta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \gamma \quad \nu \quad$ rat, repeated infra c. i1.7, тó тє yà $\rho \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ à $\rho \chi \eta_{\nu} \boldsymbol{\kappa} . \tau . \lambda$. , is abundantly illustrated
 e.r. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\text {., including this passage amongst his instances. [See Bonitz, Zeit- }}^{\text {I }}$ schrift f. Oest. Gymn. 1867, pp. 672-682, quoted in Index Aristotelicus s.v. re, ad fin., where, amongst other passages, a reference is given to
 סeì $\pi \rho \omega ิ \tau о \nu$.
' This also accounts for the fitness of this kind of language for poetry, because poetry is inspired. It must therefore (be used) either in the way above described, or with irony, as Gorgias did, and (in) the passages of Plato's Phaedrus'. The 'passages' referred to are 23t D, èà äpa
 סıAvpáц $\beta \omega \nu$ фө́́ryouat, alluding to the exaggerated and enthusiastic expressions with which Socrates had been inspired by the local influence; in particular to the rhapsody at the conclusion of his speech,





A specimen of Gorgias' irony is found in Ar. Pol. III 2, 1275 b 26,


 read, with Schneider, for $\lambda$ apıoбorooov́s retained by Bekker. "Aristotle




I


refers to an ingenious evasion of an awkward question. Whilst Gorgias was in Thessaly, where he seems to have spent a considerable time at Larissa, some Thessalian, who had no doubt heard his boast that he was able and ready to answer any question upon any subject, took him at his word, and asked him what constituted a citizen.-This is the constitutional question which gives occasion to Aristotle's quotation.-Partly in jest, and partly because he was really at a loss, he replied, that citizens were made by citizen-manufacturers: as the vessels made by mortarmanufacturers were mortars, so those made by the Larissaean-manufacturers were Larissaean citizens- or Larissaeans: for there were such
 also some kind of kettle or other cooking-utensil. The reply is much the same as if some one being asked, What makes a citizen of the town of Sandwich ? were to answer, 'a cook, for he is a sandwich-maker'; and is no bad specimen of the way in which Gorgias most likely fulfilled his promise of solving any problem whatsoever that was proposed to him. It may be doubted whether, as Schneider supposes, there is also an ambiguity in $\delta \eta \mu$ оovpy $\hat{\nu}$ : the word bears also the sense of a magistrate, as the grammarians tell us, especially in Doric states. Larissa was not a Doric state: but we learn from K. O. Müller, Dor. Bk. III ch. 8.5 ; from


 these, and Aristotle applies it to 'magistrates' in general, Pol. vi (Iv), 4, 1291 a 34 . See further on this subject, Müller's Dorians, u. s." From a note in Camb. Fourn. of Cl. and Sacred Phil. Vol. III No. vil p. 80, with additions [see also p. 180 of Thompson's edition of the Gorgias].

## CHAP. VIII.

On rhythm in Prose.
In the paraphrase of the Introduction I have already given an outline of the contents of this chapter and their connexion, with references and some details, pp. 303-306. And on rhythm in general, and its application to prose, there is an Appendix (C), pp. 379-392; in which is a full account of its original and derived significations in the first part, and of its distinction from $\mu$ érpoy in the second. The commentary on this chapter will therefore deal principally with the details of the language, allusions, and such particulars as require explanation, which are omitted in the paraphrase.

In the fragments of Isocrates' T'́ $\chi \downarrow \eta$, collected by Benseler in the Teubner series, Vol. II p. 276, we have the following, fragm. 4-cited from

## 

 Maximus Planudes ad Hermog. and Joannes Siceliotes- $\delta \lambda \omega s$ $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\delta} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ íyos
 entire agreement with Aristotle, § I ; the disagreement of the second with the statements of § 4 is equally striking. It seems from what is said of Thrasymachus and the paean in § 4, that the subject of prosaic rhythm was not included in the té $\chi^{v a u}$ of himself and the succeeding writers on Rhetoric. It does not appear even in the Rhet. ad Alex. Cicero, de Or. III 44. 173, attributes to Isocrates the first introduction of 'numbers' into prose composition.

Dionysius de Comp. Verb. c. 25 (p. 197 R.) refers to this chapter of Aristotle in support of his observations on rhythm in prose. His own opinions on the subject are given, pp. 195, 6.

References are made by Cicero to this chapter (§ 4 et seq.), de Or. I 47. 182, 183, in the course of his dissertation on rhythm, from § 171 foll. The same subject is treated, Orat. c. LXIII 212 seq. The various rhythms heroic, iambic, trochaic, \&c. are discussed in c. LXIV, where Aristotle's opinions, as expressed in this chapter, are twice referred to, § 215,218 . In § 214 we have, temeritas ex tribus brevibus et longa est, quem (sc. paeanem) Aristoteles ut optimum probat, a quo dissentio. Cicero is referring to this chapter, from which the other references are taken: and as this is not found there, he must be either quoting inexactly, from memory, or perhaps confounding Aristotle's opinion on the point with that of one of the other rhetoricians whom he mentions, § 218 . There is likewise an incorrectness in the opinion which he there attributes to Aristotle, that the paean is, aptissimus orationi vel orienti vel mediae : Aristotle says nothing of the 'middle' of the sentence.
 seq. (Rhet. Gr. Spengel, III 270-273) who also refers thrice to this chapter of the Rhetoric. Quint. IX 4.45 seq. There are references to this ch. in $\$ 87,88$.

On the abuse of rhythm, which degrades and is incompatible with

§ r. 'The structure (figure, fashion) of the language (i. e. prose composition) should be neither metrical (run into verse) ${ }^{2}$ nor entirely without measure or rhythm: for the one has no power of persuasion, because it is thought to be artificial (supra, c. 2.4, $\pi \in \pi \lambda a \sigma \mu$ éves), and at the same time
${ }^{1}$ A remarkable instance of this defect in composition is quoted by Twining on Poet., note 36, p. 209, from Dr Smith's System of Optics-where, as he truly says, one would least expect to find such a thing-the beginning of Bk. Ic. 2847 , Where parallel rays Come contrary ways And fall upon opposite sides. This is decidedly more metrical than a parallel instance in one of Dr Whewell's treatises on Mechanics, Hence no force however great, Can stretch a cord however fine, Into an horizontal line, Which is accurately straight [Whewell's Mechanics I p. 44, ed. 1819, Facetiae Cantabrigienses p. 162]. Quintilian is particularly indignant at this introduction of a verse into prose writing: versum in oratione fieri multo foedissimum est, totum; sed etiam in parte deforme, Ix 4. 72. [For iambic verses in the prose of Isocrates, see Paneg. § 170, èxpîy ràp aüroùs elmep





also diverts (the hearers' attention, from the main subject or the proof of the fact): for it makes him attend to the recurrence of the similar cadence. And so (the audience anticipate the answering or recurring cadence) just as the children anticipate the answer to the herald's summons, "Whom does the freedman choose for his attorney? and the answer is, Cleon"'.
imirponos one who is charged or entrusted with the management of his case, or of any business as deputy for another; procurator, èmurpómots
 roúrov, $\dot{\delta} 8$ ' èitrooros Mi入vús, 'his man of business, deputy ${ }_{2}$ agent'.

On Cleon's self-assumed functions of public prosecutor and poor man's advocate, see Grote, Hist. Gr. ch. liv, Vol. vi. p. 667 seq. An example in Arist. Ran. 569, (one of the tavern-keepers says,) $\tilde{\theta}_{1} \delta \dot{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$

 inferences as to the real nature of Cleon's misrepresented policy. The children, in the illustration, are so accustomed to the invariable reply to the herald's proclamation, for an attorney or deputy to plead some freedman's cause-who by law was not allowed to speak for himself in courtthat they have learned to say 'Cleon' whenever the question is asked. It has not been noticed that this story is told in the present tense, as if the children were in the habit of doing this in Aristotle's own time. Can it be meant that the custom had been handed down from generation to generation for a century or so after Cleon's death? If so, it is a very remarkable fact.

With the opening words of the chapter, comp. Cic. Orat. LI 172, Is (Aristoteles) igitur versum in oratione vetat esse, numerum iubet. Ib. § 189 , of verses unintentionally introduced by the orator in his speech, Inculcamus per imprudentiam...versus; vitiosum genus, et longa animi provisione fugiendum. With dimiAavov к.т...., comp. Ib. LXII 209, Si enim semper utare (these studied arts and tricks of rhetoric), quum satietatem adfert tum quale sit etiam ab imperitis agnoscitur. Detrahit praeterea actionis dolorem, aufert humanum sensum actoris, tollit funditus veritatem et fidem... Lxv 220, Multum interest utrum numerosa sit, id est, similis numerorum an plane e numeris constet oratio. Alterum si fit, intolerabile vitium est; alterum nisi fit, dissipata et inculta et fuens est oratio.
§ 2. 'That (composition) which is (entirely) devoid of rhythm (has no measure) is indefinite (or, unlimited), but it ought to be limited, only not by metre (like verse): for the infinite (indefinite, unlimited) is displeasing and (i. e. because it) cannot be known. But everything is defined (or limited) by number; and the number (numerus in both its senses) of the structure of the language (prose composition) is rhythm, of which metres are so many sections'. Here we pass for a moment into I Platonic metaphysics. The doctrine of the formless, vague, indefinite,





unlimited, infinite of more or less, of degree ; into which $\tau \grave{~ o ̀} \mu$ éfptov order, harmony, measure, symmetry, law-the mean-are introduced by the limiting $\pi$ épas, the definite principle; coming originally from the Pythagoreans, is adopted and expounded by Plato in the Philebus, 23 E et seq. The principle is applied to the numbers or measures of music and com-



 ception of rhythm, as he did likewise his grand division of $\bar{v} \lambda \eta$, the informis materia, the potential, unenergized matter, the material cause of all things; and $\lambda$ of jos, the formal cause, that which gives form and substance to the brute matter, energizes or realizes it into complete existence, and is the original design, or conception in the mind of the Creator, the 'what it was to be', to $\tau i{ }^{\eta} \nu$ rival: and also his doctrine of the



 igitur, sive compositionem sive perfectionem sive numerum vocari placet, adhibere necesse est, si ornate velis dicere, non solum, quod ait Aristoteles
 $\mu$ érpov, 'measure of time', Ib. § 227, sonantium omnium quae metiri auribus possumus.
 from the Pythagoreans, who traced the laws of the universe in numbers and mathematical symbols. Kaì $\pi a ́ \nu r a ~ \gamma a ~ \mu a ̀ \nu ~ r a ̀ ~ \gamma ı \gamma \nu \omega \sigma к o ́ \mu e \nu a ~ a ̀ p ı \theta \mu o ̀ \nu ~$
 Stobaeum, Böckh, Philolaos, p. 58. "The finite in number is the calculable, that which the mind can grasp, and handle ; the infinite is the incalculable, that which baffles the mind, that which refuses to reduce itself to law, and hence remains unknowable." Grant, Essay on Ar. Ethics,




 metres, verses or systems of verses, are definite lengths or sections, into which the indefinite matter of rhythm is as it were cut. Similarly it is said, III 9.3 , that the period and all metres are measured by number.
§ 3. 'From this it may be inferred that the speech (i.e. prose composition) should have rhythm, but not metre ; otherwise it will be a poem


(verse-composition). Its rhythm however should not be exactly and nicely finished': (i.e. with exact and systematic accuracy so as to be continuous, and pervade the whole structure of the writing. The description of prose rhythm by Hermogenes, $\pi \in \rho i$ i 8 ê̂y $a^{\prime}$, Introd. p. 391, Appendix on $\dot{\rho} v \theta \mu o ́ s$, will serve as a commentary on this and $\mu \dot{\mu} \chi \rho \iota ~ \tau о \hat{\imath}):$ 'and this will be effected if it be only carried up to a certain point (and there stop short; left incomplete and irregular; not finished and systematic, like verse)'.
§4. 'Of (the three) rhythms, the heroic (hexameter, epic) is (too) stately (or solemn), and deficient in conversational harmony'. By using the word 'harmony', I have left it open whether we are to understand by depovia 'harmony' in its ordinary musical sense-in which case the meaning will be 'that particular kind of harmony which is adapted to ordinary conversation', the language of common life, and inferior to that of the heroic thythm-a somewhat non-natural interpretation; or in the primary, more general sense of the word, ' an adaptation or fitting of parts into an organized whole', which with $\lambda^{\prime \prime}$ кtıкฑ̂s will signify 'deficient in conversational structure', in an adaptation of parts fitted for conversation (Dionysius uses áphovia as equivalent to $\lambda^{\prime} \hat{\xi}$ es, for style of composition); the iambic is the very language of the vulgar, and therefore of all measures the iambic is most frequently uttered in common speech (or conversation); but it wants (the acquisition of, yevé $\sigma \theta a l$ ) solemnity and dignity and the power (or faculty) of striking. The trochaic is too farcical (has too much of the comic dance about it; reminds one of its indecency and buffoonery ${ }^{1}$ : is totally devoid of all dignity and sobriety, too light and lively): this is shown by the trochaic tetrameters, for the tetrameter is a tripping (running, rolling) measure ${ }^{2}$.
 'epic', including the spondaic and anapaestic, is one of the three kinds of rhythm, its basis, $\beta$ ácts-corresponding to the 'feet' in metre-expressing the ratio of equality $1: 1$. See further on the doctrine and ratios of rhythm, in the Appendix on that subject, Introd. p. 387, foll. where the statements of the following sections are illustrated. The epithet $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu$ ós has been already applied to it in III 3.3 ; Dionysius, de Isocr. Iud. c. II (p. 557. 3, Reiske), designates it by the similar epithet


 that the heroic or hexameter measure-Homer's verses for instance-are deficient in harmony is absurd in itself, and contradictory to the evidence of our own ears, and all ancient authority: at all events Dionysius was not

1 This may possibly be included in the meaning of the word here: but if so, it is quite subordinate. In the references from other authors it is predominant.
${ }^{2}$ т $\rho 0 \chi \epsilon \rho$ 's $\dot{\rho} v \theta \mu b s$. There are some bars in the overture to Auber's Brouse Horse, which, to those who are acquainted with it, will perfectly represent the measure of trochaic tetrameter, and illustrate the epithet here used, implying a light, tripping, metre.




of that opinion, who says, de Comp. Verb. c. 18 (p. 109, Reíske), the exact




 which had been already proposed by Vincentius Madius, ad loc., and since approved by Spalding ad Quint. IX 4.76, and finally adopted by Bekker and Spengel, each in his latest ed.
 and twice in Poet. XxII.19. The Latin rhetoricians make the same remark upon their own language. Cic. de Or. III 47. 182, Orat. Livi 189, magnam enim partem ex iambis nostra constat oratio, LVII 192. Quint. IX 4.76, Illi (trimetri) minus sunt notabiles, quia hoc genus sermoni proximum est.
ikotingal] is used here in a much milder sense than its ordinary one, to strike, excite, mettre hors de soi, to displace or remove a man out of his ordinary state of feeling, to a higher one of excitement: whereas in this metaphorical application, it usually implies a much more violent emotion than mere admiration or amusement, as Demosth. c. Mid. 537 ult., rav̂ra




т тохаîos корঠ̀aкıкळ́тєроs] Cic. Orat. Lvil 193, Trochaeum autem, qui est evdem spatio quo choreus, cordacem appellat (Aristoteles), quia contractio et brevitas dignitatem non habeat. Quint. IX 4.88, herous, qui est idem dactylus, Aristoteli amplior, iambus humanior (too like the language of vulgar humanity) videatur: trochaeum ut nimis currentem (rןoxє $\boldsymbol{\rho}^{\boldsymbol{v}}$ )


 The characteristics of the кópóa̧, a kind of Comic dance, may be gathered from notices in Theophr. Char. 6, $\pi \in \rho \grave{2}$ árovoias, ' desperate recklessness', where it is a mark of this character to dance the cordax sober and without a mask: in Aristophanes, who takes credit to himself, Nub. 540, for never introducing it into his comedies: in Athenaeus, XIV 28, ult. 630 E, who calls it $\pi$ alyvic'ons, 'sportive'. Dem. Olynth. II § 18 (of Philip's mode of

 to have been accompanied by the grossest indecencies, so that no respectable person could allow himself even to look on the performance of it. See further in Müller, Hist. Gr. Lit. Xxvir 7.

This however is not the point of the reference here. But the кópoak








was accompanied by verses in the trochaic tetrameter, and these are identified ; and all that is implied here by the term is the lightness, the want of gravity and dignity, and the dancing tripping measure, afterwards expressed by $\tau \rho o \chi$ cos ; as we see also in the passages of Mic. and Quint. This character always belonged to the tetrameter ; and hence we are told that the dithyrambs, from which Tragedy took its rise, were originally written in this measure, which was afterwards exchanged for the iambic, the metre nearest to the language of ordinary conversation, when the dialogue had been introduced, and Tragedy assumed a regular form. To ं





These rhythms being set aside, (they are in fact reducible to two, the proportions $1: 1$, and $2: 1$, iambus and trochee, - - and- respectively) the third 'the paean remains, the use of which began with Thrasymachus, though he and his followers couldn't tell what it was (did not know how to define it). The paean ${ }^{2}$ is the third (of the rhythms) and closely connetted with the preceding: for it has the ratio of three to two ( $\frac{3}{2}: \mathrm{I}$, three short, and one long syllable equal to two short), whilst the others have that of one to one (dactyl, spondee, anapaest), and two to one (iambus and trochee), severally. And one and a half ( $\frac{3}{2}: 1$, the ratio of the paean) is connected with these (two) ratios ['next to' both ratios, ie. the mean between the two extremes, $1: 1$ and $2: 1$ ], and that is the paean'. On this see Introd. Appendix on $\dot{\rho} v \theta \mu \dot{\prime}{ }^{\prime}, \mathrm{pp} .387,8$. The paeonic ratio includes also the bacchius and cretic. These three ratios are the קáates of the three measures.
§ 5. 'Now all the rest (of the $\dot{\rho} v \theta \mu \mathrm{oi}$ ) are to be discarded, not only for the reasons already mentioned, but also because they are metrical (too suggestive of the cadence of regular verse): but the paean is to be adopted: for it is the only one of the rhythms named which cannot be made into a regular verse, and therefore (the use of it) is most likely
 rhythm, not metre. Hermann, Elem. doctr. meir. if 19, de vers. Crit. (near the beginning of the chapter), has a criticism of this passage which

[^4]




${ }^{1}$ addiditit Beker, ed. IIL.

he quotes, attributing to the author a misconception of the nature of the paeonic measure, which has caused him to fall into the error of denying it to be a metre ${ }^{1}$., See Cic. Orator, § 194, paean autem minime est aptus ad versum; and the whole section. Also § 218, numerus a quibusdam (Aristote, no doubt), non pes habetur. 'At present the one (form of) paean is employed (at the end) as well as at the beginning (of the sentence), but the end ought to be different to the beginning'.
 writer like Aristotle the supplement or opposite may be very well supposed to be implied in the kai.
§ 6. 'There are two kinds of paean opposed to one another, of which the one is suitable at the beginning (of the sentence or period), as in fact it is employed: and this is the one which begins with the long (syllable), and ends with three short. Daגoyevès cire Avxiap, "O Delosborn, or if perchance Lycia" (were thy birthplace). The poet, whose alternative is cut short by the inexorable brevity of the quotation, was doubtless going on, as the manner of the ancient poets is, to offer the deity whom he was addressing the choice of the various titles under which he was known and worshipped, expressive of place of birth, special character or office : which was done to avoid the possibility of giving offence by omitting any title of honour of which he might be specially proud. The following specimens of a very frequent custom will suffice to illustrate it. Hor. Carm. Sec. line 14, Lenis Ilithya... sive the Lucina probas vocari seu Genitalis. Sat. II 6. 20, Matutine pater, seu Iane libentius audis. [We may also compare Horace's enumeration of the favourite haunts of Apollo, qui rore puro Castaliae lavit crines solutos, qui Lyciae tenet dumeta natalemque silvam Delius et

 was apparently about to add after $\Lambda u k i a \nu, \nu \epsilon \in \mu \nu \nu$ or some such word, offering the god the alternative birthplace of Lycia, if he happened to prefer it. The Homeric epithet Avkrjévis, Il. $\Delta$ IoI, II9, is usually supposed to denote his Lycian birthplace, Patara, though Müller, Dor. II 6.8 , would "rather understand" by it 'born of light'. On the epithet Aúketos, frequently applied to Apollo by the Tragedians, as Aesch. Suppl. 668 (with Paley's note), Sept. c. Theb. 133, Agam. 1228, Soph. Oed. R. 203 (Schneidewin), Electr. 6, \&c. \&c., see Müller's Dorians, iI 6. 8, where the various significations of Apollo's titles are discussed at length ; and Donaldson's New Cratylus § 269, on the connexion of $\lambda$ úkos with
${ }^{1}$ Though I cannot see much force in Hermann's argument against Aristotle, yet it must be owned that it is odd to deny that to be metrical, which derived its very name from the hymns to Apollo which were principally written in that measure, as may be seen from the two specimens here quoted.


 - $\Delta a \lambda o \gamma \in \nu$ ès cíтє $\Lambda u \kappa i ́ a \nu$

к $\alpha i$

## $\chi р и \sigma є о к о ́ \mu а$ 'Екатє таî Diós.

 $\delta_{\epsilon} \mu \alpha \kappa \rho a ̀ ~ \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha i a \cdot$


 $\lambda u ́ \kappa \eta$, and $\S 89$ 首кos, no such connexion is suggested.]

Brandis' 'Anonymus' [Philologus iv. I] reads "دa入oyevés", eita, " $\Lambda$ úккє éx $\kappa$ áepye".

Victorius has noted that this and the following quotation are both commencements of paeans to Apollo, from which the name of the metre is derived : and each of them exemplifies the ' paean at the beginning'.
" "Golden-haired Archer son of Zeus". The other, the opposite to this, in which three short syllables form the beginning, and the long one comes at the end. "After earth and its waters, night obscured (blotted out) ocean"'. In the Greek line there are four pure paeans, all of this construction $-\infty-$ : but Ar. appears to quote it as an exemplification only of this form of paean in the last place of the verse, or rhythm.
i' ${ }^{\text {ivevarias }]=i v a v t i o n s, ~ o r ~ i v a v t i o n, ~ e x ~ o p p o s i t o . ~ P o l i t . ~ V I I I ~(v) ~ 11, ~} 1314$


 8 , $\dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \xi$ évavrias. é $\xi$ évavtiov is the more usual form. The ellipse to be supplied is according to Bos, Ellips. p. 325 (562, ed. Schäfer), xópas, corrected to $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \bar{\eta} \bar{s}$ by Schäfer ad loc., q. v., where several instances of the omission of that word are produced. But the ellipse of ódós, in one or other of its cases, is very much more common than that of $\chi \omega^{\omega} \rho a$ or ${ }^{\prime} \rho \chi \chi^{\prime}$, in the formation of adverbs and quasi-adverbs in the feminine, genitive, dative
 ber of instances of these three varieties of the ellipse of o̊os is collected under that head in the work referred to, pp. 188-192; and at p. 192 init. $\dot{e}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\pi}^{\prime}$ '̀vavtías $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\prime} \rho \in \sigma \theta a t$ is rightly inserted among them by Leisner (one of the earlier editors).
'And this makes a (true and proper) end: for' ( $\gamma$ áp: the reason of this, that the long syllable is required for the end, may be inferred from the consideration that follows of the incompleteness, \&c. of the short syllable) 'the short syllable by reason of its incompleteness makes (the rhythm appear) mutilated (cut prematurely short)'. Cic. Orator, §§ 214, 215, 218, u.s.


 ті̀ $\nu$ jv $\theta \mu$ о́v.




 other examples see the Lexicons.
' But the (sentence or period) should be broken off (brought abruptly to a close) and the end marked by the long syllable-not (however) by the scribe (or copyist), nor by a marginal annotation (marking the end of the sentence), but by the measure itself'. 8 ta with the accusative, which indicates the cause or motive, (not the medium, channel or means, which is $\delta$ ad with genitive,) here implies that the indication of the end of the sentence should not be due to the scribe or his marks, stops, or what not, but solely to the rhythm : that the end should appear by the abrupt close of that.

тараураф $\dot{\eta}$, a by-writing, or marginal annotation. That these were occasionally stops appears from our use of the word 'paragraph': just as the words that we use for stops, comma, colon, period, originally represented members of the period or the whole period itself. Victorius aptly quotes, Tic. Orat. c. Lxvii § 228 (already referred to), quod ait Aristoteles et Theophrastus, ne infinite feratur ut fumen oration, quale non aut spiritu pronunciantis aut interductu librarii, sed numero coacta debet insistere. And to the same effect de Orat. III 44. 173, where the librariorum notae are again mentioned. Victorius also cites Isocr. Antid. § 59-to the
 Ernesti Lex. Tech. Gr. s. v. [In the papyrus of the Funeral Oration of Hyperides, preserved in the British Museum, and edited in facsimile by Professor Churchill Babington, the approach of the end of a sentence is indicated by a short interlinear dash below the first word of the line in which the sentence is about to close.]
§ 7. 'So this subject, that the composition should be rhythmical, and not altogether without rhythm, and what rhythms, and how constructed, make style rhythmical, is finished and done with'.

## CHAP. IX.

We now come to another kind of apmovia, the adaptation of the several parts of the sentence to one another in order to its fit composi. ion (apta composition, Tic. [de Orat. III 52. 200]), shewn in the arrangement of its words and subordinate clauses. The subject of the chapter is accordingly the period and its construction; and some of its leading figures-those originally introduced by Gorgias and his school-are illustrated by several examples from Isocrates' Panegyricus.






Of the two principal varieties of style, the єiрó $\mu \epsilon \nu \eta$ and катєотра $\mu \epsilon ́ v \eta$ $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \xi \iota s$, the latter more usually called $\pi \epsilon \rho เ o \delta \iota \kappa \eta$, the style of Demosthenes, Isocrates, and the more finished rhetoricians, there is a detailed account in the Introduction, in the analysis of this chapter, p. 306 seq. So that we may at once pass on to the translation, and the particular points of interest and difficulty that the text offers. On Dionysius' distinction of three varieties of style, see p. 306, note 4 . On the eipopév $\lambda_{\text {é }}$ ıs, the earlier style of Hecataeus, Herodotus and the $\lambda_{\text {oyoypápot, see }}$ p. 307, and 306, note 5 ; and on àaßo入ai, to which this style of prose is compared, p. 307 note 1. The opposite style, $\dot{\eta}$ кaтєбтрацдє́vך, is described at length, pp. 308-310. See Ernesti, Lex. Techr. Gr. s. v. $\sigma v \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon \in-$ $\phi \epsilon t \nu$. For a good description of both, following Aristotle, see Demetr. $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ ép $\quad \eta \nu \in i a s$ § 12.
§ I. 'The style must be either loose and concatenated' (the sentences loosely strung together, connected solely by connecting particles, as $8 \dot{\text { é, }}$ kaí, like onions on a string) ' and one only by the connecting particle, like the preludes in the dithyrambs, or close and compact (i.e. periodic) and resembling the (regular) antistrophes of the old lyric poets', Pindar Arion, Stesichorus, and the like. The last of the three is said to have owed his new name of Stesichorus-his original name was Tisias-to his having been the first to bring the chorus to a stand, make it stationary, for a time at least ; and give it order, regularity, symmetry, and dignity. This is also attributed to Arion.
§ 2. 'Now the loose style is the ancient (original) one. "This is the setting forth of the researches of Herodotus of Thurii." This style which was formerly universal is now confined to a few. By loose I mean that which has no end in itself except the completion of the subject under discussion. And it is displeasing by reason of its endlessness (or indefinite length or character, supra c. 8. 2); for every one desires to have the end distinctly in view'. Quintilian, viII 5.27, thus describes the cipo $\mu$ év $\lambda \epsilon$ '́gıs, soluta fere oratio, et e singulis non membris sed frustis collata, structura caret. Cicero, Or. LV 186, notices the want of 'numbers' in Herodotus and his predecessors: which may possibly include the periodic structure of sentences; as Aristotle does, infra § 3,

'Hoo̊órov Oovpiov] This appears to be the reading of all MSS,
 established at Thurium in 443 (Clinton, F. H. sub anno 443, col. 3), and was thence sometimes called a Thurian from this his second birthplace. So Strabo, XIv c. 2, (Caria,) p. 657, of Halicarnassus;










 $\mu \epsilon \nu o \nu$. The second of these passages may be interpreted to mean, that the reading in Plutarch's time was often found altered in the copies of Herodotus' history, from 'A入ıxapvaroćos to Өovpiov; and if so, no doubt Aristotle's copy may have had that reading, which he transferred to his Rhetoric. But on the other hand, Demetrius, $\pi \in \rho i$ é $\rho \mu \eta \nu \in i a s, ~ § 17$ ( $\pi \epsilon \rho \boldsymbol{i}$ $\pi \epsilon \rho(o f o o v)$, in quoting the same passage, follows the reading of all our mSS
 other inaccuracies of quotation (in the Rhet.), the transposition of $\eta \delta \varepsilon$,
 form-leads me rather to conclude that the variation from our text is due here, as we have already seen in so many other instances, to our author's carelessness in quoting from memory, without referring to the original. Aristotle was a book-collector, and no doubt possessed a copy of Herodotus. Victorius thinks that the reading here is sufficiently justified by the fact that Herodotus did actually become a citizen of Thurii, and was so called. But the point here to be decided is not whether he was ever so called by others, or even by himself at odd times; but whether he did, or did not, write himself a Thurian at the commencement of his own history: which I deny, and attribute the implied assertion of that fact as a mere misquotation to our author himself.
'And this is why it is only at the goal that (the runners) pant (or gasp) and become faint, because whilst they are looking forward to the limit of the race they don't flag before that (i.e. before they have reached the goal)'. This, as I have said in Introd. p. 3II, note, seems the explanation of the illustration which is required by the application of it and by the context. The sight of the goal before them, the term of their labour, keeps up the racers' spirits and stimulates their exertions, so that they neither faint nor fail till they reach it: then íknvéovot кal êk they breathe hard, and their exertions being over, their sinews are

* relaxed, they slacken and grow languid. This interpretation, which is opposed to that of Victorius (see note u.s.), makes the ка $\pi \tau \pi r^{\prime} \rho$, which is properly the turning-point of the diavios-whence its name-here the goal of the $\sigma \sigma^{\prime} d_{i o v}$ or single race, in a straight line : the ка $\pi \pi \tau \dot{\eta} \rho$ of the 8iau入os being in fact the $\pi \epsilon^{\prime} \rho a s$ of the $\sigma r a \dot{d} \iota o \nu$. If the $\kappa a \mu \pi \tau \dot{\eta} \rho$ were intended here for the turning-point, the statement made of it could not be true, for in that case the runners would not come in sight of the goal until they had passed the кадлтíp. So in Eth. N. v. 1. 2, 10956 1, an illusration is borrowed from the single foot-race, the $\sigma \tau<\dot{8} 8 \mathrm{ov} ; \boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\varphi}$



 elephants). Xen. de Ven. 5. 5, dogs lose their keen smell in the
 (oivos) én入úet, de Gen. Anim. I 18.51, ék

§ 3. 'Such then is the loose ('jointed' Mure, H. G.L.) kind of style; the compact, condensed, concentrated, kind is the periodic, that which is constructed in periods : by period I mean a sentence (lit. kind of style or composition) having a beginning and end in itself, and a magnitude such as can be readily taken in at one view'. The other style is ä́neıpos, perpetua, indefinite, continuous, running on without end, and without proper divisions; and therefore can't be comprehended in one view. є v́vúvoriov,
 purposes of supervision). So of a tragedy, Poet. vii 10.74, exetv $\mu$ ì





'A style of this kind is agreeable, and easy to be learnt' (evjualis, passive; see Aesch. Eum. 442, Sóph. Aj. 15, Trach. 6ir, where 'easy to be learnt' means 'readily intelligible'); 'agreeable, because it is the contrary of the endless, indefinite, and also because the listener is constantly thinking by reason of this constant definite conclusion (or limitation of each sentence) that he has got hold of something (got something in his grasp-in the way of a conclusion) for himself ( $a \dot{v} \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\varphi}$, retained by Bekker and Spengel ; quaere avitê?); whereas, to have nothing to look forward to (no conclusion to anticipate) either to be, or to be finished (ảvv́єıv, ఱ゙art $\tau \iota \nu a ̀$ àvv́єtv), either fact, or effect, is disagreeable'. It occurred to me that eivat, which seems superfluous, might have arisen from a repetition of the eiv in $\pi \rho o \nu o c i v . ~ T h e$ translation will then be, 'nothing to look forward to nor to finish (get done, effect)': ävúcı identifying the hearer with the speaker, as if he














'And easy to be learnt because easily recollected: and this because the periodic style can be numbered, and number is of all things the most easily recollected'. The proportions, or relations of the several parts or members of the period to the whole, and to one another-its symmetrical structure-can be expressed in numbers, like the numerical relations of rhythm, c. 8. This gives the periodic structure a hold upon the memory, by its definite proportions, which is entirely wanting to the continuous and indefinite succession of the other.
'And this is why every one recollects metres (verses) better than (disorderly) irregular prose; because it has number which serves to measure it'.

 random, in confused mass, one after another, without order or discrimination. Thus, in distinguishing the symmetrical structure of verse from the comparative confusion and disorder of prose, Plato, Legg. VII 8ir d,
 Platonice, 'just as they are', 'just as it happens', 'indiscriminately', 'without order or regularity'; or 'without consideration', 'just as it may be'. Heindorf Gorg. § 127 and Ast's Lex. Plat. s. v.) ; Phaedr. 264 B, ov̉ $\chi$ v́ $\delta \eta \nu$



 miscuously anything that comes into their head). Arist. Pol. IV (vii)
 heap, indiscriminately, at random, without order or system), de part.
 referred to by Dionysius, Ars Rhet. x 6 (v 381 ed. Reiske), ov̉ $\chi$ viðךv, wis

§4. 'The period must also be completed (or brought to a conclusion)
$\mu \grave{\eta} \delta_{\iota} \alpha о ́ \pi \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota ~ \omega ̈ \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho ~ \tau \grave{\alpha}$ इофок入є́ous iа $\mu \beta \epsilon i \alpha$,


 Пєлото⿱亠䒑и́бои．
by the sense（kaí，as well as by the structure and rhythm）and not broken off abruptly（without completing the sense：סıakóntety＇to cut in two＇）， like Sophocles＇iambics，＂Calydon is this land of the Pelopian soil－＂： for the contrary supposition（to this real fact）arises from（lit．is caused by；dativus instrumenti）this（wrong）division（in general），as also in the instance given，that Calydon belongs to the Peloponnesus＇．

We learn from the Anonymous Scholiast on this passage（see Brandis＇ tract［Philologus IV i］pp．46，7，）and more precisely from the Schol．on Ar．Ran．1269，that this verse comes not from Sophocles，but from Eur．Meleager，of which it is the commencement．See Wagner，Fragm． Eur．Mel．I（Fr．Tr．Gr．II 270）．The second verse，which completes the author＇s meaning，is supplied by Lucian，Conv．c． 25 （Hemsterh．III．436），

 makes it clear that this misstatement was not due to Euripides．As to the substitution of Sophocles for Euripides as the author，I have no doubt， from the abundant evidence we have already had，that it is due solely to a lapse of memory on Ar．＇s part，and that no alteration of the text，as sug－ gested by Vater and Buhle，is required．

The stop，or pause，which the speaker or reader makes，when intro－ duced in the wrong place，may make a complete alteration in the mean－ ing：as here，if the verse be read as an entire sentence with the pause at $\chi$ Oovos，it conveys the meaning that Calydon is situated in the Pelopon－ nesus，which is contrary to the fact：but if it be read continuously without a pause with the ensuing line，the true sense becomes clear．8iatpeívOat here is equivalent to סıa⿱宀tijac III 5．6，comp．Anon．ap．Brandis，p．47，oiá

 division＇，de Soph．El．4， 166 a 33，тapà тウ̀v 8ıaipectv，where two verses are quoted in illustration．

Demetrius u．s．quotes the two verses in illustration of a different kind of fault；the interpolation of a $\sigma \dot{v} \delta \in \sigma \mu \circ-$ in which he includes interjec－ tions－by actors，as an expletive．Oi $\begin{aligned} & \text { è } \\ & \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ o v i d i ̀ \nu ~ a ̉ v a n \lambda \eta \rho o v ̂ y r e s, ~ \phi \eta \sigma i, ~\end{aligned}$

 то́ $\rho \theta_{\mu}$


The MSS，with the exception of $A^{j}$ ，have пeגoteias，which is found also in Demetrius and retained by Bekker and Spengel；ms A；Lucian，the Schol．on Aristophanes，Dindorf（Eur．Fragm．Mel．2），and Wagner，read the more usual form חedomias．The text of Euripides，who alone of the



 three Tragedians uses the word，has חe入ómtos in five places，including the line of the Meleager（Beck＇s Index）．
§ 5．＇A period may be either divided into clauses，or simple（con－ fined to one）＇．Ar．himself defines what he means here by d̀ $\phi=\lambda \lambda_{\eta} s$, viz． $\mu_{0} \boldsymbol{\nu}_{o ́ x} \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{o s}$ ，a sentence consisting of a single member，without the com－ plication，or elaborate construction of the period．$\dot{a} \phi e \lambda \eta$＇s properly denotes smooth and level，without inequalities or irregularities，as Arist．Eq．527， $\delta_{i a} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \phi \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \pi \in \delta i \omega \nu \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \rho \bar{\rho} \dot{\rho} \epsilon$ ．It is therefore＇plain＇as opposed to ＇mountainous＇，literally and metaphorically，level，easy to be traversed， simple，plain；whereas the mountain is suggestive of difficulty．It is ap－ plied by Dionysius，de admirabili vi dicendi in Demosthene［c．2］，to Lysias＇ style，which is said to be $\lambda_{t \tau \eta}$ кaì à $\phi_{\ell} \lambda \lambda_{j} s$ ，＇smooth and plain or simple＇．
 and Herodotus，and the complex periods of Isocrates and Demosthenes ： and a comparison of the sentences of Lysias with those of Demosthenes will clearly shew the difference between the $\dot{\alpha} \phi \in \lambda \lambda^{\prime} s$ and $\dot{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \bar{\nu} \kappa \dot{\lambda} \lambda o t s$ $\pi \epsilon \rho i o \delta o s$. Quint．IX 4．124，12．5．Genera eius（periodi）duo sunt ：alterum simplex，quum sensus unus longiore ambitu circumducitur；alterum， quod constat membris（ìv каंगois）et incisis，quae plures sensus habent． Habet periodus membra miximum duo：medius numerus videntur quat－ tuor（so Cic．Orat．§221），sed recipit frequenter et plura．
－The period in clauses or divisions must be complete in itself，duly divided（its members distinct and definite），and such as can be easily delivered without stopping to draw breath＇（lit．easily breathed，well adapted to the limits of the breath）．

є̇̉avátvevaros］Cic．de Or．III 44．175，Rudis orator incondite fundit．．． spiritu non arte determinat．Orat．§228，Non spiritu pronunciantis．．． debet insistere．
＇Not however（ $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ ，if，provided，it be not）by the mere（arbitrary） division（as if the speaker might pause for breath，wherever he pleases，） as（in）the period already cited（Ka $\lambda \nu \delta \dot{\omega} \nu \mu \grave{\nu} \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \delta \epsilon \ldots$ ），but as a whole． A member or clause is one of the two parts of this．By simple I mean a period of a single member＇．It appears from this that a period，according to Ar．，is a sentence that includes a complete sense ${ }^{1}$ ，and is thereby distinguished from a к $\boldsymbol{\omega} \lambda o \nu$ or member of it ：which is a member or part of a whole，and therefore incomplete until the whole has been expressed．The period therefore is twofold，simple，movóкшлos，
 compound period primarily or essentially into two parts，which stands for，and may be extended to，division in general．Cicero，as Vater
 of the кผิ入ov．The period may consist of one，two，three or four，colons．
 of the $\mu$ ооо́кклоs $\pi$ теiodos．

## 

 observes，acknowledges the compound alone to be a true period．Tò dè





 pp．312，3，note I．

нооо́ксы入os appears in a totally different sense，Pol．Iv（viI）7， 1327
 like a man with one arm or leg；opposed to the Athenian，in se totus teres atque rotundus．
§ 6．＇The members or clauses and the periods themselves should be neither truncated（cut prematurely short），nor too long＇．Constat ille ambitus et plena comprehensio ex quattuor fere partibus，quae membra dicimus，ut et aures impleat et ne brevior sit quam satis sit neque longior． Cic．Orat．§ 221.
$\mu v o v \rho o v s]$ This word is variously written $\mu v$－and $\mu \epsilon i-o v \rho o s$, and so here the MSS．The Lexicons，including Stephens＇，regard them as two differ－ ent words：Stephens only distinguishing the sense，$\mu$ eiovpos，ко入íßovpos， bob－tailed，with a stunted tail ；$\mu$ vovoos，sharp－tailed，like a mouse： while Liddell and Scott，and Rost and Palm，deriving $\mu$ vioupos from a mouse＇s tail，set the facts of the case at defiance by defining it nevertheless＇curtailed＇，＇abgestutzt oder abgestumpft＇．This at all events is no doubt the meaning of it．It seems to me rather that the word is the same，and the variety only in the spelling．The meaning of it is always the same；bob－tailed，curtailed，originally；and thence blunted，truncated，docked，maimed，cut short where you would naturally expect a prolongation．Comp．Poet．c．XXVI 13 ，éàv $\mu$ ìv êva
 turally，unduly，curtailed．See Twining＇s note，p．557．He refers to

 part．Anim．III I．13，of blunt－nosed，as opposed to sharp－nosed，fishes：oi
 кó́фayot $\mu$ úovpot（a bulldog＇s nose is particularly $\mu$ v́ovpos）．And again iv 13．22，the same remark is repeated．Pausanias，x 16．1，describing one

 pyramid．Athenaeus（XIV $632 \mathrm{D}, \mathrm{E}$, ter，）of three kinds of defective verses； aкє́фa入ot，at the beginning，as a verse beginning with $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\eta} ; ~ \lambda a \gamma a \rho o i$, prop．spider－shaped，contracted or weak in the flanks；hence of verses， faulty in the middle（claudicant in medio Schweighaüser ad loc．），where a short syllable occurs for a long one in the middle of the verse：illustrated by Il．B［II］731，and another hexameter which Schweighaüser can＇t find，and
 the verse；of which three specimens are given，II．M［XII］208，another which







is misquoted from Il. $\Theta$ [VIII] 305, and a third from Od. $i^{\prime}$ [IX] 212. This passage of Athenaeus is quoted at length by Hermann, El. doctr. metr. II 26.20. Athenaeus writes $\mu$ eíovpos. Ernesti Lex. Techn. Gr. s. v. $\mu$ eiovons.
'For that (sc. the көิ入ov) which is too short often makes the listener stumble (balks him by bringing him up short and abruptly); because if, whilst he is still hurrying (eager) to get on (forward), and to the (end or completion of the) measure (rhythm), of which he has already a definition (i.e. a definite and preconceived notion) in himself, he be suddenly pulled up (checked, lit. pulled against) by a pause (a premature cessation on the part of the speaker), there must necessarily follow (arise yifver $\theta a \iota$ ) a sort of stumble by reason of the check'.
$\pi \rho o \sigma \pi t a i \epsilon \iota \nu]$ must be regarded as a subst. in the accusative before $\gamma_{i} \gamma_{\gamma}$
 a sudden and unexpected check, or pulling against him, will often cause a horse to stumble, or bring him on his knees. The abrupt cessation of the onward motion, in the listener's mind, as in the horse's career, produces analogous effects-whence the metaphor-in the two cases.
'Those again which are too long produce a feeling of being left behind, like those who (in a measured walk, as in the colonnade of a gymnasium) turn back only after passing (not till they have passed) the limit; for they too-like the speaker that uses too long periods-leave behind their companions in the walk'.

The notion is that of a party walking backwards and forwards in the portico of a gymnasium, the walk, like the period, being properly limited, though the limit is capable of being passed. If one of the party -suppose Aristotle himself in his daily $\pi \epsilon \rho i \pi a r o t$ in the Lyceumchanced to have thus outstripped his companions, the latter would be left in the lurch, and be no longer able to hear him. Similarly the speaker who makes his periods of undue length, leaves his hearers in the lurch : they stop short, as it were, and lose the thread of his discourse. і̀ $\pi$ oкá $\mu \pi$ Tetv is here not in its usual sense, but 'to turn away' in the sense of


On this subject comp. Cic. Orat. LiII 178, itaque et longiora et breviora iudicat et perfecta ac moderata semper expectat; mutila sentit quaedam et quasi decurtata, quibus tanquam debito fraudetur offenditur, productiora alia et quasi immoderatius cxcurrentia, quae magis etiam aspernantur aures, et seq.


 $\sigma \alpha \nu \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i \not \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau \rho o ́ \phi \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \beta o \lambda \alpha ́ s$,



＇And in like manner also the periods that are too long become so many speeches，and like a dithyrambic prelude；that is，rambling and incoherent，without unity or system．

 For $\boldsymbol{g}^{\mu}$ otov cf．triste lupus stabulis，et sim．On àvaßoiń，see note 1 ， Introd．p． 307.
＇And therefore what Democritus of Chios quoted to taunt Melan－ ippides for writing（long，rambling）dithyrambic preludes instead of the（compact and regular）stanzas，is realized（in these overgrown periods）．＂A man works mischief to himself in working mischief to another，and the long dithyrambic prelude is most mischievous to its
 the original，Hesiod．Op．et D．263）：for a taunt of the same kind may also be appropriately applied to the long－membered gentry，（the dealers in long－membered periods）＇．The makers of the periods are themselves called here $\mu$ акро́кшло．To scan the second verse of the quotation $\mu$ a－ крävaßo入̀ must be read as a crasis．＂Democritus Chius Musicus， Abderitae aequalis teste Diogene Laertio，IX 49 （ $\gamma \in \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ óvãt 8 ®è $\Delta \eta \mu$ óкрıto九
 Meminerunt eius Suidas s．v．xtá̧̧ıv，Pollux，IV 9．4，Arist．Rhet．III 9. De hoc omnium optime egit Coraes ề Xtakîs＇Apxato入oyias＇Y $\lambda_{\eta}$＇Аtakr． 111 p．192，seq．＂Müllach，ad Democr．Fragm．p． 9 I．

In the note on ávaßo入ai，Introd．p．307，already referred to，may be found some account of the two kinds of dithyramb here alluded to ；the earlier antistrophic form of that of Arion，Stesichorus，Pindar， and the novel，relaxed，often incoherent，extravagances，of Melanippides and his followers．Nevertheless，Melanippides is selected by Aristo－ demus，in answer to Socrates＇question，Xen．Mem．I 4．3，as the most distinguished representative of dithyrambic poetry，as Homer of epic， Sophocles of tragedy，Polycletus of sculpture，and Zeuxis of painting． This represents the popular judgment，as opposed to that of the critics． On this subject，I have referred to Bode，Gesch．der Hell．Dichtk．Vol． It Pt．II p．III seq．and 293 seq．and to Müller，Hist．Gr．Lit．c．xxx． See also Arist．Probl．XIX 15．Of Melanippides of Melos，there is a life in Smith＇s Biogr．Dict．［E．Curtius，Greek Hist．Vol．Iv p． 102 of Ward＇s tr．］
＇Those which have their members too short make no period at all： and so it（i．e．the period made up of these short $\kappa \omega \bar{\lambda} \alpha$ ）drags the hearer with it headlong＇．The audience is carried away by them，as by a
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horse，at a headlong，break－neck，pace．Specimens of this style are given in Introd．p．314，note 1 ．
§ 7．＇The periodic style has two divisions，of which the one has its clauses（simply）divided，the other opposed to one another；an instance of simple division is，＂I have often wondered that those who first assembled these universal gatherings and established the athletic con－ tests．．．＂＇8ıppquév $\lambda^{\lambda}$ égıs，＂in qua membra periodi copula a se invicem distinguuntur．＂Ernesti，Lex．Techn．Gr．סatafeiv．This is the opening of Isocrates＇Panegyric Speech，supposed or intended to be delivered at the＇General Assembly＇of the great Olympic games－whence the name．It is remarkable，and shews that Ar．could not have looked at the passage he was quoting，that the very next words to those at which his quotation stops，long before the end of the sentence，contain a regular antithesis or opposition of members，and the＇simple division＇ is absolutely confined to the words cited．I should suppose that he could not have been aware of this．
＇（An instance）of the antithetic period，wherein in each of the two clauses contrary by contrary are brought together，or（the same word is imposed as a yoke，i．e．bracket，or vinculum，on both contraries）the two con－ traries are coupled together by one and the same word，is＂Both they served，them that remained，and them that followed；for the one they acquired more land than they had at home in addition，and to the others they left behind sufficient in what they had at home．＂vino 0 ои́， （staying behind）is contrary to áko入oviӨnots（following），ikavóv to $\pi \lambda \epsilon \in i o \nu$＇．

It is unnecessary to say that the passage is quoted wrong：it runs


 on which see note suprac． $5 \S 7$ ；the second，of the antithesis of con－ traries in two clauses balanced and opposed to one another．










 poıs ápuórretv. Ar. in his alteration has adorned Isocrates' text with an

 to кrฑ́ret, acquisition', as the text has it. As these two can hardly be considered antithetical, and nothing corresponding to krij$\sigma \in \iota$ occurs in Isocr., are we to suppose that Ar., meaning to write ivdeía, carelessly
 $\delta_{r} \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \epsilon$, which occurs twice in the sense of 'want' II 7. 3 and 4 : and also, in the same sense, Pseudo-Plato, Eryxias, 405 E bis.

Then follows a string of quotations from the same speech of Isocrates, illustrative of antithesis ; § 48 (wrong), § 72 (right), § 89 (right again),

 oration attributed to Lysias, § 29. This speech is marked as spurious by Baiter and Sauppe in their ed. of the Or. Att. If this be so, the figure is probably due to Isocrates, which is all the more likely as Lysias' style, $\lambda_{\text {ev̀ }}$ кal $\dot{d} \phi \epsilon \lambda \eta$ j's, is usually free from these rhetorical artifices. Victorius refers to an imitation of this, Cic. de Fin. II 34. 112, Ut si Xerxes... Hellesponto iuncto, Athone perfosso, maria ambulavisset terramque navigasset. And Lucr. III 1042 (1029, Munro), ille quoque ipse (Xerxes) viam qui quondam per mare magnum stravit, et seq.
'And what some one (some advocate, in accusation, whose name Ar. either had never heard, or didn't recollect) said against Peitholaus and Lycophron in the law-court (at some trial : quaere, theirs?), "And these fellows (ovirot, apparently 'the accused' or 'opponents' as usual) who used to sell you when they were at home, now that they have come to you here, have bought you"'. Peitholaus and Lycophron were brothers of Thebe, the wife of Alexander of Pherae. At her instigation they murdered their brother-in-law and succeeded him in the dynasty. They maintained themselves long against the attacks of Philip by the aid of Onomarchus the Phocian commander, but at last were defeated, 353-352 B. C., and Onomarchus slain ; upon which they " retired with their mercenaries, 2000 in number, into Phokis." Grote, Hist. Gr. from Diodorus, Vol. XI ch. LXXXVII pp. 366, 408, 9, II, where Lycophron alone is mentioned as 'the despot of Pherae': in p. 412,









Peitholaus and Lycophron are named together for the first time as joint commanders.

As the time, place, and circumstances, as well as the speaker, of what is here related, are alike utterly unknown, any attempt at interpreting it must be a mere guess. My conjecture is, (1) that the scene is a court of justice-where, no one can say; I will assume at Athens(2) that oitot are Peitholaus and Lycophron, as accused or defendantsthis is suggested by els II. tis circe and the use of oiro-and if so, this must have been after their downfall: and (3) that, to give the remark a point, éఱ́vŋиrat must have a double sense. 'These fellows, says some one to the judges, used when they were at home, at Pherae, to sell you (as slaves)-ípâs maliciously identifies the Athenian judges with their fellow-countrymen, captives in Thessaly-now that they are come to you, the tables are turned, and they have to buy you' (i. e. to bribe the judges). Victorius, but utterly without point, Videtur contumeliosa vox in eos iacta, qui pecunia, quam comparassent in suis civibus hostibus emancipandis, eadem postea uterentur in illis ab iisdem emendis, atque in servitudinem sibi adiudicandis.
'For all these (passages) do what has been mentioned', i. e. give an antithetical structure to the several sentences.
§ 8. 'This kind of style is agreeable because contraries are best known (in themselves and by reason of their opposition), and still better when placed side by side (in juxtaposition, for the purpose of contrast and comparison); and also because it resembles a syllogism; for the ineryos (the refutative syllogism) is a bringing together (for the same purpose) of the two opposites (the two contradictory conclusions)'.

This opposition of contraries in the antithesis, also reminds us of the ${ }^{\mathbf{E}} \lambda_{\text {er }}{ }^{\circ}$ s, the conclusion of opposites, refutation by an opposite conclusion; this resemblance makes the former look like a proof, which is a source of pleasure.

Aristotle is constantly telling us-see Bonitz ad Metaph. B 2, 996 a 18 -that contraries, which are the two extremes of things under the same genus, are also subject to the same science, rôv èvavria $\mu i a$, or $\dot{\eta}$ av̉r $\dot{\eta}$, $\boldsymbol{i} \pi \iota \sigma \pi \dot{\eta} \mu \eta$. And accordingly, inferences may be drawn from one contrary to another, Eth. N. V I, $1129 a 14$ seq. This appears to be the foundation of what is here said, that contraries are best known to us; they can be studied together, and one throws light upon the other. Comp. III II.9,

 $\sigma \nu \nu \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \eta ̀ \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \alpha \nu \tau \iota \kappa \epsilon \iota \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ є́ $\sigma \tau i ́ \nu$.



 incyरos, and the conclusion (implying learning) from opposites. In Probl. XIX 5, $\mathfrak{\eta} \delta \dot{v}$ тò $\mu a \nu \theta a \dot{\nu} \epsilon \iota \nu$ is assigned, as an acknowledged truth, in explanation of a musical fact. 'Best known' seems to mean that contraries, being under the same genus, are better known than any other things that have no such relation, or no relation at all, to one another.

On the pleasure derived from learning, which is here assumed to be the explanation of the agreeableness of this periodic style, see the notes on III.21, 23; particularly the latter, in which it is fully illustrated from Aristotle's writings. I will repeat here that the Metaphysics opens with a statement that all men have a natural longing for (strive after) know-
 implies pleasure in learning, which is the satisfaction of this natural appetite. The natural love of imitation or copying, which gives rise to all the imitative arts, is based in the same way upon the desire and pleasure of learning. And contrariwise therefore (this is additional), as we
 displeasing to us because it is unknowable. Comp. infrac. 10. 2, tò yà
 instruction to us are the most pleasing; hence the pleasure derived from metaphors, which is explained: $\gamma \boldsymbol{\lambda} \omega$ öral on the contrary, which teach us nothing, are therefore disagreeable.
$\pi a \rho^{\prime}$ ä $\lambda \lambda \eta \lambda a \rho a \hat{a} \lambda \lambda \frac{1}{}{ }^{2} \nu \omega \dot{\rho} \rho \iota \mu a$ ] juxtaposition makes things more intelligible is a fact already more than once appealed to, as II 23. 30 ; compare the parallel passage, III 17. 13; III 2.9; and again III II. 9.
 see Introd. on II 22, and note 1, p. 262, and again, on II 25, p. 268.
§ 9. 'Such then is antithesis; the equality of the members (or clauses) is mapiawors; $\pi$ aponoinots is when each of the two members (the supposition that the period consists of only two clauses is still carried on) has its extremities similar (i.e. in the letters, so that the terminations rhyme to one another). (The clauses) must have this either at the beginning or at the end. And when they (the similar sounding letters) are at the beginning (the figure is) always (expressed in) whole words (lit. the words, entire words, always are a beginning), but at the end (it admits of) either the (similarity of the) last syllables, or the same word with a changed termination (declension, adverbial, adjectival, termination, $\& \mathrm{c}$ ), or the same word. Similar sound ( $\pi$ apopoiшбts) at the com-


 aủtoû,".







mencement (may be illustrated by) such examples as this; à $\gamma \rho \dot{\rho} \boldsymbol{\nu} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ë̀ $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\beta} \boldsymbol{\beta} \in \boldsymbol{\nu}$ àpyò̀ (fallow, uncultivated) $\pi a \rho$ ' aúrov̂'. Victorius quotes a parallel




 be neither rhyme nor reason [the assonance, or correspondence of vowel sounds, is however clearly marked in the two clauses]; it is most likely

'And an inflexion (declension, change of termination from a root : see
 ägtos $\hat{\omega}_{\nu} \chi^{a \lambda \kappa o v ̂, ~ " ~ w o r t h y ~ t o ~ b e ~ s e t ~ u p ~ i n ~ b r a s s ~(h a v e ~ a ~ b r o n z e ~ s t a t u e ~}$ erected in his honour, Dem. de F. L. § 296, Фìııттov Gavmá̧ovat кai
 àyopâ ; as a public benefactor), not being worth a brass farthing"'. (Supposed to deserve a brass statue-bronze in reality-when he doesn't deserve a brass farthing. This is in fact more in the nature of a mapo-
 to class both under his $\pi a \rho o \mu o i \omega \sigma t s)$.
 who repeats all this, following Arist. very closely, and sometimes borrowing his examples, supplies in his version a word which is wanting in our text, both to the sense and to the due balance of the sentence: $\sigma \dot{v} \delta^{2}$

 $\kappa \omega \bar{\lambda} \omega \nu$, $\pi$. ঠцоотєлєúrov, Rhet. Gr. 111 262-268, ed. Spengel. This sentence was applied by some rival orator to one who, after slandering some one all his life, after his death wrote a panegyric on him-which, the speaker says, was just as bad as his slander ${ }^{1}$.

[^5]＇And（a rhyming termination arising）from a single syllable：$\delta \in \iota \nu$－óv．．． $\dot{a} \rho \gamma-\dot{o} v$. And the same clause may have all three at once，and the antithesis and balance of clauses，and similar termination may be the same＇（included or exemplified in one or the same clause）．An instance of this is given by Victorius from a saying of Gorgias preserved by Plutarch，Cimon．c．10，
 Fragm．Sauppe，Or．Att．III p．131，Fr．Inc．6．This is not only anti－ thesis and the rest，but a false antithesis to boot．Demetr．，u．s．§ 23，has supplied a much more elaborate example from Isocr．Helen．§ 17．т $\hat{\varphi}$

 $\sigma \pi \eta \sigma \in \nu)$ ．＇The commencements of periods（in this view of the artificial structure of the sentence）have been enumerated with tolerable（ $\sigma \chi \subset \delta$ óv ＇pretty nearly＇）completeness（ $\epsilon \xi-$＇out＇，＇to the end or full＇）in the Theo－ dectea．There are also false antitheses，as Epicharmus，besides others， （кaí）wrote，тóка $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ к．т．入．＇This line of Epicharmus is also given by Demetr．u．s．§ 24 He speaks of it as＇said in jest＇，$\pi \in \pi a \subset \gamma \mu$＇vov－rò

 thesis and the rest of these rhetorical novelties．

For further details on the subject of these rhetorical figures intro－ duced by Gorgias and his school，who carried them to a vicious excess， a style to which the term 「opyıá̧eıy was afterwards applied；which was thought to have attained its highest perfection in the measured and laboured，empty and monotonous，periods of Isocrates；－see the paper on Gorgias，Camb．Fourn．of Cl．and Sacred Phil．，No．viI，Vol．III．p． 69 seq． where they are classified and arranged under three heads，representing parallelism in sense，structure，and sound，which is in fact Aristotle＇s division．Illustrative extracts from Gorgias＇speeches are given at p． 67 ： and a collection of his fragments in Sauppe，Fragm．Or．Att．（appended to the Or．Att．Vol．III）p． 129 seq．［Compare Blass，die Attische Bered－ samkeit，I pp．60－62，and Thompson＇s ed．of the Gorgias，Appendix，On the Fragments of Gorgias．］

Perhaps the most complete specimen of Isocrates＇style in his Pane－ gyric，from which I will select one or two illustrations，is § 76 ，ov่ $\gamma$ à $\rho$

 and so on，in the same measured strain．Of $\pi \alpha \rho o \mu o i \omega \sigma t s$, we have an
 кaì $\gamma \nu \omega \dot{\mu} \eta \boldsymbol{\eta}$ ，к．т．入．The rhyming terminations pervade §§ 185,186 ，cul－ minating in a sentence，in which for once the echo is really effective，

 Ctes．p． 65 §78，at the close of a paragraph，ov̉ yàp rò̀ трómov ả入入à ròv
 orba sum．）No better illustration could be found of the importance of

Chancellors：that the prospect of having his life written by him added a new terror to death．

## PHTOPIKHE $\Gamma 9$ §§ 9, 10; $10 \S$ r. 107








 the precept so much insisted upon by Aristotle, that the art employed in composition should be carefully concealed, than the striking difference in point of interest between the studied, monotonous, wearisame periods of Isocrates, and the animated, vigorous, natural, yet rhythmical periods of Demosthenes, on which though at least as much pains and labour had been bestowed by the one as by the other-the critics said 'they smelt of the lamp'-in the one the study entirely escapes notice, in the other it is most painfully apparent.

On antithesis and the rest, there are also remarks in Introd. pp. 314, 5, and the note: and on the divisions of the period, ко́ $\mu \mu a$ and $\kappa \omega \lambda \lambda \nu$, of which the last two are not distinguished by Ar., p. 312, note 1 .

The meaning and authorship of the Theodectea has been already discussed at length, p. 55, seq. The conclusion arrived at is, that the work here referred to was an earlier treatise on Rhetoric by Aristotle, the result of his rhetorical teaching, which confined itself to the subjects
 confined by the expression to the j jo九oкdirapkrov, may perhaps, as Victorius supposed, be intended to include by inference all the other figures described in this chapter.

> CHAP. X.

This chapter offers a remarkable exception, at all events in the first six sections, to Aristotle's ordinary manner of writing; in that the thoughts are in some degree written out and the meaning fairly represented by the language: instead of being left, as usual, to the sagacity of the reader to fill up and interpret as best he can.
§ I. 'Having discussed and settled the preceding subject we have next to describe the sources of lively, pointed, sprightly, witty, facetious, clever, and popular (eidort $\mu$ ouvra) sayings. Now to make them is the result either of natural ability (cleverness) or of long practice (exercise); the exhibition (or explanation) of them is the province of this study (or treatise)'. ev่фvís, note on I 6.15. The Rhet. ad Alex. c. 22 (23) treats of áareiov in style, apparently with much the same meaning as that of Aristotle. See the analysis of the chap. in Introd. p. 434. Brevity is at all
 to Campbell's 'vivacity' of style, which is treated in the first three chapters of his third book.
$2 \mu \epsilon$ Oódov таи́тทs. $\epsilon i \neq \omega \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ ov̉v каi $\delta \iota \alpha \iota \theta \mu \eta \sigma \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \theta a-$










§ 2. 'Let us then describe it by a complete (thorough or detailed) enumeration, and let this be our starting-point. Learning namely with ease (without trouble or labour) is naturally agreeable to every one, and names (nouns) are significant; and therefore all nouns or words from which we learn anything are most agreeable'. On this see note on c. 9 § 8, add c. 11.9, and I 11. 21, 23 .
' Now words strange, foreign, archaic, are not known at all (and can therefore convey no information), and the proper, ordinary, names of things, we know already. It is the metaphor (the only remaining kind of single word) that does this in the highest degree: for when (the poet, Homer Od. $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ [xiv] 214) calls old age a (dry, withered) stalk or stubble, he conveys learning and knowledge through the medium of the genus, because both are withered', 'are fallen into the sere and yellow leaf'. סıà toû yévous, because the metaphor brings remote members (species) of the same genus into a novel comparison, which teaches us something new of one or the other.
§ 3. 'Now the poets' similes produce the same effect (give point, vivacity, or liveliness, to the narrative of an epic poem, in which they usually appear): and therefore if the simile be well (selected or executed, or both), it gives an air of liveliness, point, vividness to the composition. For the simile, as has been said before' (not literally what is said here, but the substance of it, III 4.I), ' is a metaphor, differing from it merely by the manner of setting forth (mode of statement): and therefore it is
 written in a longer form, at greater length), and (because) it does not say directly that (of the two things compared) one is the other; and accordingly (as the speaker's tongue does not say this, so) neither does the (hearer's) mind look out for it'-and so loses the opportunity of learning.
$\mu a \kappa \rho o t e ́ \rho \omega s]$ On this termination of the adv. comparative, see Jeff, Gr. Gr. § 141.3, Donaldson's Gr. Gr. § 282 b , [Kühner, Gr. Gr. § 158, 2]. Matthias has omitted it.

The meaning of $\pi \rho o \theta^{\prime} \dot{\sigma} \epsilon$, by which the simile is said here to differ from

## PHTOPIKHE $\Gamma$ 10 §§3,4.











the metaphor, may be inferred from the previous passage referred to, III 4.I, but is not there directly expressed. It means the 'mode of setting forth', of describing or stating the comparison which both of them make; just as in c. 13. 2, 3 (in Ar.'s division of the speech), and Rhet. ad Alex. 29
 of the case' or exposition of the facts. There are two distinguishable points in which the simile differs from the metaphor; the length, and (consequent) dilution of the force of its impression. The metaphor is concise, generally expressed in a single word, which suggests the comprison, and identifies the two things compared, $\lambda_{\text {éyet }}$ dis rov̂ro ickeivo; so that the comparison is forced directly upon the hearer's mind, who thereby learns something: whereas the simile goes into detail, often to a considerable length, so that it loses the pointed brevity of the metaphor ; and instead of identifying the two objects compared, like the other, by the introduction of the particle of comparison as, so weakens its force that the hearer is apt to lose the lesson and the pleasure that should be derived from it.
§4. 'Accordingly in style and enthymemes, all those' (raûra, agree-
 former of the two) 'are pointed and lively, which convey to us instruction rapidly'. Then follows a note on the preceding. 'And this is the reason why neither superficial enthymeme are popular-by superficial (yáp, videlicet) I mean those that (lie on the surface, and) are (therefore) plain to everybody (so that he who runs may read) and require no research or investigation-nor those which when stated are unintelligible (to a popular audience); but all those of which the knowledge is acquired at the moment of delivery-even though it did not exist previously-or (in which) the understanding is only a little in the rear (of the speaker). For in the one case knowledge as it were is acquired; in the other, neither the one nor the other', i. e. in either of these two ways there - is a sort of learning, either immediate or nearly so : in the other case, that of superficial and unintelligible enthymemes or style in general, neither immediate nor quasi-immediate knowledge is attainable. Compare with this the second clause of 1123.30 .








1 colon.
§ 5. 'Such is the approved (popular) kind of enthymemes in respect of the sense or meaning (in their intellectual aspect). In that of style or language, so far as regards the figure (i. e. the structure of the period and its clauses), the popularity is attained by the antithetical expression of them (the balance of opposite clauses or members), as in the example,

 crates' text, Aristotle having altered the arrangement, as usual ;-'war is antithetical to peace':-
§6. 'and in the single words, by the metaphors they contain, and these neither foreign and strange', (compare III II. $5, \boldsymbol{i} \pi^{\prime}$ oikeiav, where reference is made to this place; so that $\dot{a} \pi^{\prime}$ oiketw may be
 with III 2. 9, metaphors should be 'appropriate', ápuorroviasas, or ix row ává入oyov 'derived from a proportional or kindred subject': and ibid.

 nor superficial, for these produce no impression. Further, (words are popular) if they vividly represent (things that they describe); for things should be seen (in the orator's description of them) as if they were actually being done (going on, transacted, before the hearer's eyes) rather than as future. This is in fact the 'historic present', applied to future, instead of past, events. On $\pi \rho \grave{̀} \dot{\partial} \mu \mu a \dot{\tau} \tau \nu$, see note on iI 8. I3. db $\lambda$ отрiay "alienam, ductam a rebus arum propinquis et affinibus," Victorius; who also, as a parallel case, refers to Mic. de Or. II 59.24I, est autem haec huius generis virtus, ut ta facta demonstres, ut mores eius de quo narres, ut sermo, ut vultus omnes exprimantur, ut ios quid audient tum keri ala fierique videantur.
'These three things then are to be aimed at (in the attempt to give vivacity and pungency to style), metaphor, antithesis, and vivid reprosensation'.

The meaning of evépyea is clearly shewn by a comparison with
 $\pi o t \in \nu, \S 2$, and is principally shewn in animation, literally and metaphorically, in a vivid, vivacious, style, and in animating, vivifying, inanimate objects; investing them with life, motion, and personality ${ }^{1}$;

[^6]



 (Eth. N. $\mathrm{x} 4,1175 a \mathrm{I}$ ). This sense is borrowed from the metaphysical use of the term, to express 'realization', as opposed to divapus, the mere capacity or potentiality of life and action. I may add that èvepyea is used in two distinct senses, representing two different forms of development, which may be distinguished as the metaphysical and moral applications of it ; as will appear from a comparison of the form it assumes in the Nicom. Ethics, and the biology of the de Anima. It is sometimes identifiable with èvené $\bar{\chi} \epsilon a$, expressing the actuality or actual realization of existence out of a mere undeveloped capacity of life : in the moral view, it is the realization of action, a realized activity, from the dormant capacity-implying existence-to the active exercise or energy of the bodily and mental functions. So happiness is an evépyea
 sub init. and again c. 4 , ult. c. 5 , sub init.: and the def. of pleasure in the seventh (Eudemian) book, èvépyeta àvéruódoctos. Sometimes three stages are distinguished (as frequently in the de Anima), illustrated by three degrees of knowledge in man: (1) the latent capacity, (2) knowledge acquired but not exercised, and (3) the active exercise of thought and knowledge by $\theta \epsilon \omega \boldsymbol{p}^{2}$, philosophical contemplation and speculation ${ }^{1}$.

Quintilian on èvépyeca, vili 3. 89, èvépyeca confinis his (est enim ab agendo dicta) et cuius propria virtus, non esse quae dicuntur, otiosa. Ib. 6. 11, Praecipueque ex his oritur sublimitas quae audaci et proxime periculum translatione tolluntur, quum rebus sensu carentibus actum quendam et animos damus; qualis est, pontem indignatus Araxes. From ivépyea another quality of style is to be distinguished (in Quint) viz. 'ivápyeta, 'clear, lively, graphic, narration,' (evidentia,) though near akin to the other. It is mentioned IV 2.63, and distinguished from perspicuitas, viil 3.61. èvápyeta, quae a Cicerone illustratio et evidentia nominatur, quae non tam dicere videtur quam ostendere : et affectus non aliter, quam si rebus ipsis intersimus, sequentur [id. vi 2. 32]. See Ern. Lex. Tech. Gr. s. v. et èvépyeta.
§ 7. 'Of the four kinds of metaphors, the proportional are the most popular'. On metaphor in general, and the proportional metaphor in particular, see Appendix B to Bk. III, Introd. p. 374

Here follows a string of pointed, striking, sayings, exemplifying
${ }^{1}$ At the conclusion of Mr Mill's Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Phil. p. 559, we find the following remark. "In Aristotle's case the assertion (of Sir W. H.) rests on a mistake of the meaning of the Aristotelian word evepyela, which did not signify energy, but fact as opposed to possibility, actus to potentia." Had Mr Mill turned to the first two sentences of Aristotle's Ethics, or to the chapters on Pleasure, x. 4, 5, he would have seen reason to alter this statement. By 'energy' I suppose active, vigorous, exercise to be intended.




 $\nu \eta \nu$. каi K $\eta \phi \iota \sigma o ́ \delta o \tau o s ~ \sigma \pi o v \delta a ́ \zeta o \nu \tau o s ~ X a ́ \rho \eta t o s ~ \epsilon u ́ \theta u ́ v a s ~$
rò $\boldsymbol{a} \sigma \tau \in i o \nu$ in style; all of them metaphors, and most of these conveyed in single words. They do really, I think, deserve the character attributed
 by Dionysius; Ep. I ad Amm. c. 8, in his enquiry into the date of the Rhetoric. The most important variation from the text of Ar. is the omission of the example from Leptines "by all the MSS" (Spengel's Tract on Rhet. Munich 1851 p. 47), though it has been supplied in the printed copies; he begins the quotation with кaтà $\lambda \epsilon \in \xi \iota \nu$ oűro $\gamma \rho a ́ \phi \omega \nu$. The only other difference of any importance is áyayóvza for ë $\chi о \nu \tau a$, and סıđóvat oũtos for 8uêval.
'As Pericles said, that the youth that had perished in the war had vanished out of the city, as though one were to take the spring out of the year'. On this saying, and Pericles' claim to it, see note on I 7.34.
'And Leptines of the Lacedaemonians, (to the Athenian assembly,) that he would not let them look on whilst Greece became one-eyed (lost one of her eyes-the other being of course Athens; Athens, the eye of Greece, Milton, P. R. iv 240). Victorius has produced similar expressions from Cic. pro leg. Manil. c. 5 § II, de Nat. Deor. III 38, Hi duos illos oculos orae maritimae effoderunt. "Similiter Cimon Atheniensibus sua-

 Polit. Praecept. 803 A)," Victorius. The Leptines here mentioned is no doubt the proposer of the law $\pi \in \rho \grave{i} \tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{d} \tau \in \lambda \in i a s$ against which Demosthenes delivered the speech c. Leptin. in B.C. 355. He may possibly be the same as the Leptines mentioned by Demosth. c. Androt. § 60 , ó ék Koìns. Wolf, Proleg. ad Dein. Leptin. p. 45, note 12 (Schäfer, Appar. ad Dem. p. 8), supposes that the author of this saying and the opponent of Demosthenes are the same person. The occasion on which Leptines produced his metaphor was the embassy sent by the Lacedaemonians to Athens in their extremity, after the defeat of Leuctra ( 371 b.c.), during the invasion of their country by the Thebans, B.C. 369 ; see Xen. Hellen. vi 5. 34, 35, Isocr. Archia § 64, seq. Grote, Hist. Gr. Vol. x [ch. LXXVIII] p. 320 seq. Thirlw. Hist. Gr. ch. Xxxix (Vol. v. p. 106, ist ed.). Isocrates, Areop. § 69, alludes to the same event, ${ }^{\circ} \sigma \boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon$ Make-
 тоутаs $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ (see the fragm. of Lysias, Or. 34, quoted in note on II 23. 19,

 นévovs. [A. Schaefer's Dem. u. s. Zeit, I p. 75, note.]
'And the saying of Cephisodotus, in his indignation at Chares' eager-




 ness for the scrutiny of the accounts（of his charge）in the conduct of the Olynthian war，＂that he drove the people into a fit of choking by his （pertinacity in the）attempt to offer his accounts for scrutiny in this way．＂＇ He wanted to force his accounts down their throats，and nearly choked them in the attempt．I have followed Dionysius＇version of this extract，which is plainly preferable to the text of Aristotle．äyelv els $\pi \nu i \gamma \mu a$ is Greek and sense；$\tilde{\epsilon}_{\chi \epsilon \iota \nu}$ cis $\pi \nu i \gamma \mu a$ neither one nor the other； and סơóval oũzas，at the end，has far more meaning than the simple doûval of our text．With the vulgar reading，é $\chi$ oura must be taken with ràs ev̇⿴囗⿰丨丨⿱亠v it indicates the eagerness with which he was trying to force them upon the people－but then $\delta o \hat{\nu} \nu a t$ rò $\nu \delta \tilde{\eta}_{\mu}{ }^{2}$ eis $\pi \nu i \hat{\gamma} \mu a$ ，for＇to drive them into a choking－fit＇，is surely indefensible．

Cephisodotus，ó éx K $\epsilon \rho a \mu \in ́ \omega \nu$ ，has been already quoted；sec III 4.3 note （near the end of the section［p．53］），where some account is given．Two more of his pungent sayings are quoted further on．Chares，with his mercenaries， was sent to take the command in the Olynthian war in 349 B．C．（Clinton， F．H．）．Olynthus was taken by Philip，347．This notice is cited by Max Schmidt in his tract On the date of Ar．＇s Rhetoric，p．15，as a piece of evidence on that question；but the limit of the period of publication can be brought much lower down．See Introd．On the date of the Rhetoric，p． 36 seq．
$\pi \nu i \hat{\gamma} \mu a$ or $\pi \nu i \gamma \mu o ́ s$, and its congeners，is a medical term，used by Hip－ pocrates，expressive of choking，stifling，suffocation．
＇And the same（Cephisodotus）once in an exhortation to the Athe－ nians said that they must march out（at once）to Euboea（to the aid of the Euboeans），and there provide themselves with provisions＇（read by all means èmıбırıбopévovs，the future，with Spengel；Bekker retains the vul－ gata lectio èrıбtrıбapévous，which spoils the point），＇like Miltiades＇decree＇ （with all the unhesitating haste prescribed by Miltiades＇decree at the time of the first Median invasion）．They were therefore not to lose any time in making provision at home，but to get to Euboea with all speed and there provide themselves：the future is necessary：Victorius，though he reads the aorist，translates it as the future．This hurried expedition to Euboea occurred in 358 в．c．，Clinton，F．H．，sub anno，Dem．c．Androt．§ 14 ， $\boldsymbol{\iota} \sigma \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\circ}$
 § 85．It was made to assist the Euboeans against the Theban invaders； and in the archonship of Cephisodotus himself．
rò Mı入тcíסov $\psi \eta$ ク́фı $\sigma \mu a]$ is explained by the Scholiast，quoted by Vater，
 and more at length by Ulpian in Shilleto＇s note to Dem．de F．L．§ 346，

 grammatical construction of the accusative，it seems to be a substitution




 make an expedition，such as，on the principle of，Miltiades＇decree，with all haste，and without deliberation．
＇And Iphicrates，indignant at the truce that the Athenians had made with Epidaurus and the neighbouring coasts，said of them that＂they had stript thenselves of their provisions（not＇for the way＇，but）for the war＂＇．é申ódica are viatica，provisions for a journey；which in the absence of inns the traveller had to carry with him ：here，provisions for the support and maintenance of war and its expeditions．Hdt．writes énódia， Xen．é申ódıov（sing．）．Arist．，Pol．II．5， 1263 a 37，uses it of provisions for hunting expeditions in Lacedaemon．

The small independent state of Epidaurus，bounded by the territories of Corinth，Argolis，Troezen，and the Sarqnic gulf，was at this time in alliance with Sparta，to which it supplied troops，in the great contest with the confederate Greeks，allied for the reduction of the Lacedae－ monian power，terminating in the battle of Corinth， 394 B．C．，see Grote， Hist．Gr．Vol．IX［ch．LXXIV］p．422， 425 ；and Xenophon＇s description of the battle，Helen．IV 2．9－23．It appears from this passage that the Athenians had made a truce with Epidaurus．Cephisodotus＇indignation was aroused at the folly of making a truce with people who had a sea－board，which the Athenians with their naval superiority could have plundered with im－ punity，and so have supported the war．
＇And Peitholaus（called）the Paralian（trireme）＂the people＇s cudgel＂， and Sestos＂the corn－stall of the Piraeus＂＇．Whether this Peitholaus is the same as the one already mentioned III 9．7，as associated with Lyco－ phron in the government of Pherae，we have no means of precisely deter－ mining．The probability is that he is．For even Aristotle＇s careless－ ness could hardly have carried him so far as to neglect to mention the distinction between two persons named so nearly together，if there were any．This being so，it appears again，as from the former passage，that he lived at Athens after his downfall．
 picked vessels，fast sailers，and with carefully chosen and highly paid crews，kept in reserve at the Piraeus for state purposes；such as sacred embassies，$\theta$ ecoiau，to carry the admiral of the fleet in a naval expedition， for ordinary embassies，＇for the transport of money and persons＇（Böckh， Publ．Econ．，Bk．II．C．16，Lewis＇Transl．p．240），and for the pursuit and conveyance to Athens of state offenders who had made their escape；as Alcibiades after the mutilation of the Hermae，Thuc．vi 53，61 bis，of the Salaminia．As illustrating the use of the Paralus as a fóna入ov，Demosth．





## 


impeachment, and the Paralus, were the three principal instruments of pronishment of offenders amongst the Athenian citizens. The Mápaios therefore is here compared to a fómàon or cudgel, because it is the instrument with which the state deals her heaviest blows, not only upon those that have escaped her justice, but upon all those who offend her.
 т $\rho \bullet \eta \rho \omega \nu$, Harpocr. s. v. He adds that the crews of the two vessels received four obols a day, and stayed at home the greater part of the year. Photius has four articles on the word, one of them borrowed from Harpocr., almost in the same words. The first of the four identifies the Salaminian and Paralian. There is an article upon this in Smith's Dict. of Ant. (s. v. Salaminia).

Sestos, on the Hellespont, seems from this passage to have been one of the emporia for the corn which was imported from the coasts of the Black Sea and the adjacent regions. It is mentioned with others by Isocr. àrid. § 107, as an important and well-situated town. Strabo, in writing of Troas, makes no mention of the corn-stores of Sestos. [Büchsenschütz, Besitz und Erwerb, pp. 42I-430 (on the corn-trade between Greece and the Euxine). The present passage, which he does not quote, suggests a modification of his statement on p. 426 that Sestos and Abydos were less important emporia than Lampsacus.]

This corn-store or warehouse is compared to the 'shopboard' or 'stall' mitia, the tray on which corn was exposed for sale in the shops. The word was used for a 'stand' or 'stage' of various kinds. A passage which illustrates the use of it referred to here (which does not appear in the Lexicons) is Arist. Hist. An. VI 24. 3, where there is an account of a wonderful mule, that lived to the age of 80 ; after it had been released from labour by reason of its age, it used to walk by the side of the teams which were dragging the stone for the building of the temple (doubtless the Parthenon), and not only urged them on to their work, but helped them itself to drag the load up the hill (how this was done by the animal
 $\tau \hat{\nu} \tau \tau \lambda \iota \omega \hat{\nu}$. This clearly explains the particular sense of $\tau \eta \lambda i a$ in this passage. The $\tau \eta \lambda_{i}$ is the tray or stand at the corn-dealer's door, in which the corn is exposed for sale. In Aristoph. Plut. 1038, it means 'a sieve', кобкivov кúkios sive rєрıф'рєta, Schol. ad loc., Etym., Suidas and Hesychius.
'And Pericles bade (his countrymen) get Aegina out of the way (get rid of it, as a plague or obstacle to their enjoyment or happiness) "the eyesore of the Piraeus"'. This saying is quoted by Plutarch, Pol. Praec.
 óф $\theta a \lambda \mu o \nu$ тì̀ ' $E \lambda \lambda a ́ \delta a$, without the author's name. It is attributed to
 civaı rov̂ Пє九patws. Comp. Plut. Apophth. Reg. et Duc. 186 c , and Wyttenbach note $\beta^{\prime}$ ad loc. It suggested to Casaubon an emendation of an apparently unmeaning word in Strabo IX p. 395, of the islet of Psyttalea,



 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \gamma a ́ \mu o \nu ~ \epsilon ̇ \gamma \chi \rho o \nu \iota \zeta o v \sigma \omega ̂ \nu, ~$



$\lambda \eta \eta_{\eta \eta}$ and $\lambda_{\eta \mu} \hat{\nu} \nu$ seem (from the Lexx.) to be almost confined to Aristophanes amongst the earlier writers. Arist. Lysistr. 30I, with a pun upon $\lambda \eta \eta_{\mu \nu}$ ov $\pi \hat{v} \rho$ (on which see Schneidewin on Soph. Philoct. 799) ; Plut.

 however as medical terms in Hippocrates.) They are not found, where they were to be most expected, in the Fragments of the other Comic writers. No instance of either is to be found in the very complete Index to Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr.
'And Moerocles said that he was in no respect a greater knave than -one of the respectable (upper) classes that he named: for the other played the knave at the rate of 33 per, cent., he (himself) only at ten'. The degree of knavery is compared to the rate of interest or profit which is made upon each: "a very respectable person indeed!" says Moerocles "and a very respectable interest he makes upon his respectability (or, rightly interpreted, roguery) : why! I only get a third of that for mine." Of Moerocles an account is given in Smith's Biogr. Dict. s. v. Moıpok入j今,
 was a contemporary of Demosthenes, who mentions him four times, see Sauppe's Ind. Nom. ad Or. Att. III 99, and an anti-Macedonian orator. He seems from the allusion, de F. L. § 293 (§ 335) to have been a greedy fellow, and inclined to exaction in money-matters. On the rates of interest at Athens, and the modes of computing it, see Böckh, Publ. Econ. Bk. I. c. 22, Lewis' Tr. p. 130.
'And Anaxandrides' iambic verse about (not 'on behalf of', of which there is no evidence in the text) the daughters' (so in the Scriptures, 'daughters of Jerusalem', \&c) 'who were over long about marrying, "I find ( $\mu 0$ i) the young ladies have passed the day for their marriage." [" My daughters' marriage-bonds have passed their date."]
$\dot{v} \pi \in \rho \dot{\eta} \mu \in \rho \frac{s}{}$, here metaphorically used by Anaxandrides, is properly a technical term of Attic law, signifying one who has failed to pay a fine, or to comply with any judgment or verdict imposed by the court on the day appointed: one who has passed the prescribed term or the day fixed. It

 poet of the Middle Comedy, Meineke, Fragm. Com. Att. Vol. I. p. 367 seq. The line here quoted is Fragm. Inc. xvii, Meineke iII 200. Anaxandrides is quoted again, c. II. 8, an equally uncertain fragment, No. XVIII, and probably again, II. 10, also 12.3, and Eth. N. vil ir.




[^7] $\kappa \alpha \pi \eta \lambda \epsilon i \alpha ~ \tau \alpha ̀ ~ ' А \tau \tau \iota к \alpha ~ ф і \delta i ́ \tau \iota a . ~ A i \sigma i \omega \nu ~ \delta ' ́, ~ o ̈ т \iota ~ \epsilon i s ~$


pp. 369, 370. He says "Suidas is wrong in taking this ( $\pi$. $\xi$ ) to be synonymous with the roסoкáкк :" but does not tell us why, or upon $^{\text {o }}$ what authority (probably on account of the name, поঠo-кáкๆ).
'And Cephisodotus called the triremes parti-coloured (gaily-painted) (mills i. e.) millstones' from their crushing and grinding (exactions and oppressions) the Athenian tributaries and others. Comp. on this expression III 6. I, as an instance of a " privative epithet", the note on that section, near the end. On mockidovs, Victorius quotes Virg. Georg. iv 289, pictis phaselis [cf. St John's Hellenes III 302]. On Cephisodotus,

"And "the Dog" (Diogenes the Cynic) called the taverns (or wineshops) "the Attic messes".

Of Diogenes, $\dot{\delta}$ Kí $\omega \nu^{1}$, see Grote's Plato III p. 507, seq. ch. 38. "Diogenes seems to have been known by his contemporaries under this title. Aristotle (L. c.) cites from him a witty comparison under that designation." u. s. p. 509. He receives this name from the little boys or the bystanders in several of Diogenes' (Laert.) stories about him. A long list of his sayings, often witty, but usually bitter and sarcastic, is to be found in Diogenes Laertius' Life. This does not appear amongst them.
rà кamə $\lambda \in \tilde{i} a]$ retail shops ( $\kappa a \pi \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$ ), cook-shops, wine-shops and taverns. Comp. Isocr. Areop. § 49 ; speaking of the change of habits and manners

 $\chi \in \dot{v} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota^{2}$. These scenes of riot, drunkenness, and licentiousness, says the satirical Diogenes, are what the Athenians call their ovocirıa; this is their substitute for (or representative of) the sober and orderly Spartan фiditca. See the description in Grote, H. G. 11513 [chap. vI], Müller, Dor. IV 3, on the meals of the Dorians. фı8irta, or as it is usually written $\phi$ eidítia, is the name given by the $S_{1}$ artans to what the Athenians and others called $\sigma v \sigma \sigma i \tau a$, the public tables or messes at which all the citizens dined in common. Müller, u. s. § 3, II 294 Lewis' Transl.), remarks, note 2 , " It is very probable that this $\phi \in \iota \delta i t \iota a$,
${ }^{1}$ One Aristogeiton, an Athenian orator, also received this nickname, éreка入єìто

${ }^{2}$ This passage of Isocr. Areopag. is cited by Athen. XIII 21, 566 F, on tavern-







 character of these taverns will throw some light upon Diogenes' pleasantry.



(spare or scanty meals) was a ludicrous distortion of an ancient Spartan name $\phi$ i $\lambda_{i}$ ia, i. e. love-feasts." This is made still more probable by the fact that Ar. in his Politics always writes the word фıoírca-rà
 1272 b 34 -and the constant interchange of $d$ and $l$ (8áкpv, lacrima; 'Ǫ̀vaceús, Ulysses). They were originally called àvòpeía, men's meals, both by Cretans and Spartans, the institution being common to both peoples, the Spartan being in this, as in other particulars, borrowed from the



 тヘ̂̀ éralptề toîs фıд̈тiots к.r. $\lambda$.
'And Aesion, that (the Athenians) had emptied (or drained) their entire city into Sicily'. Meaning, that the Athenian forces sent over for the invasion of Sicily in $415-413$ B. C. were so enormous in proportion to the population of Athens, that they might be said to have completely drained it. 'For this is a metaphor, and sets the thing before our eyes'.

Aesion's name occurs, but only as the father of Euctemon, in Demosth. Mid. § 165. Also in a citation from Hermippus, in Plut. Vit. Demosth. (Vit. Parall.) c. II, in which he compares Demosthenes' speeches, especially for reading, advantageously with those of his predecessors. The only other notice of him that I have been able to find is Suidas s. v. $\Delta \eta \mu \sigma \sigma \theta$ év $s$ : which is merely that he (Dem.) ovveфило-
 was therefore an Athenian orator, contemporary with Demosthenes.
'And'-Aesion again-" so that Greece cried aloud": this again is in some sense a metaphor, and a vivid expression'. A metaphor no doubt (though Victorius says it is a mere hypallage), since it transfers the voice from an individual to a collective people, or country. It is $\pi \rho \delta$ $\dot{\boldsymbol{o}} \mu \mu$ át $\omega \nu$ in that it animates an inanimate object, or abstraction; c. II.





' And as Cephisodotus bade (the Athenians) take care not to convert many of their mobs into assemblies' (lit. their mobs, in any numbers). Cephisodotus we have had three times already as the author of pointed sayings, III 4.3 , and 10.6 , bis. The point of this saying seems to lie in the word $\sigma v \nu \delta \rho o \mu a ́ s$, which is substituted for $\sigma v y \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta} r o v s$ èsк $\lambda \eta \sigma i a s$. It implies that most of their ordinary assemblies are mere mobs, tumultuary gatherings, riotous and unruly, instead of $\sigma u \gamma_{\kappa} \lambda \eta \tau o \iota$, regularly convoked for special occasions in due form and order. It would certainly be







better without èk $\lambda \eta \sigma i a s$, as Wolf proposes. It would then mean " not to hold their-mobs too frequently." Both Bekker and Spengel retain the vulgata lectio: the latter with a comma between $\sigma v o d \rho o \mu a ̀ s ~ a n d ~ i ́ \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma i a s . ~$.
'And Isocrates, "to those that flock together promiscuously (scramble, as it were) in the general festivals"'. This is an expression of precisely the same import as the preceding. It occurs in Isocr. Phil. § 12, and runs thus, örı тò $\mu \grave{e} \nu$ rais $\pi$ пuvp

'And the example in the Funeral Oration, that "Greece might well have her hair cut off (go into mourning) over the tomb of those that died at Salamis, for her freedom and their valour were buried in the same grave": for had he only said "that she might well weep for the virtue that lay buried with them", it would have been a metaphor and a graphic touch, but the (addition of) "freedom with the virtue" carries with it a kind of antithesis'. This really affecting passage, which Aristotle has partially spoiled by omission and alteration, runs thus in the originalthe funeral oration attributed to Lysias ${ }^{1}$, Or. 2, in Baiter and Sauppe's Or. Att. $168, \S 60$ : "and therefore Greece might well that day cut off her hair over yonder tomb (the orator is on the spot, and points to it) and mourn for those that lie buried here, seeing that her own (the text has aùr $\hat{\nu}$, their own, the collective ' $E \lambda \lambda a ́ s$ being resolved into its component members) freedom and their valour are laid together in one grave". Aristotle has very much marred the simple beauty of the sentence (which if it be not Lysias', is at all events quite worthy of him) by his alterations;

[^8]




especially the substitution of the frigid, explanatory, $\tau \hat{\varphi} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \Sigma a \lambda a \mu \hat{\imath} \nu$, for the graphic т甲ิठ and тóvє of the original (I here follow Victorius). [The context of the original passage shews that the substitution is really a blunder, as the reference is not to the Athenians who fought at Salamis but to those who died at Aegospotami and elsewhere towards the close of the Peloponnesian war.]

The metaphor lies of course in the word кeipaz日at, by which Greece is personified and compared to a woman who, according to the national custom, cuts off her hair as a sign of mourning-on this custom see Becker's Charicles, p. 398; comp. Eur. Troad. 14I, Orest. 458, Alc. 515, Suppl. 97, 974, Hel. ıо60, $\pi \in ́ v \theta ı \mu o s, ~ \pi \in \nu \theta \dot{\eta} p \eta s$, kovpá, кovpai. Aesch. Choeph. 6 (Paley's note ad loc.), Hom. Il. Xxini. 142, \&c. The last two passages shew that this custom was not absolutely confined to women, though it was especially characteristic of them. In Lysias the personification, which is most tastelessly interrupted by the plural aủ $\begin{gathered} \\ \nu\end{gathered}$,


' And as Iphicrates said, "the course of my argument cuts right through the middle of Chares' acts" : a proportional metaphor; and the "right through the middle" sets the thing vividly before our eyes'. This was said by Iphicrates in the same case as that which is noticed in II 23.7 (see note), the prosecution, namely, of him and his colleagues Menestheus and Timotheus, together with Chares, who were all brought to trial by Aristophon the Azenian in 355 B.c. on the scrutiny of their accounts, for misconduct in their command during the Social war. Sauppe u. s. p. 19r, commenting on this passage, says " Iphicrates se et collegas accusatos defendens exponit quam male Chares rem gesserit. Hoc facturus dixit, iter orationes suae ferre per medias Charetis res gestas, quasi de itinere per hostium fines faciundo diceret." The proportion of the metaphor is this : As a road is carried, or an army or expedition marched, right into the heart of an enemy's country, so Iphicrates in his defence carried hostility and destruction (exposure and censure) into Chares' conduct during their joint command.
'And the saying, "to invite dangers to the help (rescue, remedy) of dangers" is a vivid metaphor'. The author, and occasion, of this sentence are alike unknown. I have followed Schrader in the translation. To rid yourself of one danger another must often be invoked or invited, as a man saves himself from a shipwrecked vessel by throwing himself overboard and clinging to a plank. He also quotes Florus, 1. 17, Fabius Maximus periculosissimum bellum bello explicavit. The metaphor lies
 gers, which are thereby ' animated'; tò ä $\psi v \chi o \nu$ becomes ${ }_{\epsilon} \mu \psi v \chi^{\circ} \nu$.






1 fortusse 8 de

'And (what) Lycoleon (said) in his defence of Chabrias, "not even awed by that symbol of his supplication, the bronze image (yonder)"'. Of Lycoleon nothing seems to be known, beyond what may be gathered from this passage, that he was an Athenian orator, and defended Chabrias in his trial b.C. 366.

The circumstances referred to are briefly these. In 366 b.c. Chabrias was brought to trial with Callistratus, the orator, on a charge of misconduct leading to the loss of Oropus. See ante, note ad I 7.13. Grote, Hist. Gr. $\mathbf{x}$ [chap. Lxxix] pp. 392, 3, and note $3^{1}$. Chabrias had greatly distinguished himself on a former occasion, described in Grote, Hist. Gr. $\mathbf{x}$ [chap. Lxxini] pp. 172, 3 , in an action near Thebes fought against Agesilaus and the Lacedaemonians, 378 в.c. Agesilaus "was daunted by the firm attitude and excellent array of the troops of Chabrias. They had received orders to await his approach on a high and advantageous ground, without moving until signal should be given; with their shields resting on the knee, and their spears protruded" (Diodorus, xv. 33, Cornelius Nepos, Chabr. c. I, obnixo genu scuto). "The Athenian public having afterwards voted a statue in his honour, he made choice of this attitude for the design." Ib. 173, note I. This is also referred to, the details being passed over, in Dem. c. Lept., in a long enumeration of all

 Appar. ad Dem. III 168). Lycolean in his speech points to this statue which stood in the dyoó in sight of the court, and taking advantage of the posture of it, which he interprets as that of a suppliant, appeals from it to the feelings of the judges, at the same time reminding them of the merits of the original. The effect no doubt must have been very striking. The metaphor resides in inernpiav, which is transferred from the suppliant's olive-branch (eגaiav) to a suppliant attitude in general, implied in the posture of the kneeling figure. On the accusative of the object of awe with airquve $\sigma \theta a l$, see note on II 2.22.
' For it was a metaphor at the moment (whilst Lycoleon was speaking and Chabrias was in actual danger), but not for ever (i.e. so long, and no longer; not permanently), but yet perpetually (repeat diei, Schrader) before the eyes (vivid and graphic): for it is only while he (Chabrias) is in danger that the image seems to supplicate, but the inanimate is ever animated-" the monument of his deeds for the city"'.

This very obscure sentence seems intended as an explanatory com-
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mentary on the preceding extract. It is truly obscurum per obscurius, a masterpiece of Aristotelian brevity, and a complete illustration of the Horatian brevis esse laboro, abscurus fio. I follow Schrader and Victorius in the interpretation. First he says that there is a metaphor: this of course is in the word ikeтnpiav, as above explained. But the metaphorical application of it only continues during the danger of the person represented; when that is over, and the suppliant out of danger, the statue loses indeed the suppliant character with which it was invested for the time by the application of Lycoleon, but retains the posture and its associations as "the memorial of his services to the state." (I agree with Victorius in supposing that this is a continuation of the extract, and
 niously suggests an alternative, that it may be a second extract from the same speech, alibi in eadem causa, and another example of a pointed

 presentation gives animation to inanimate objects. If this explanation be correct we must read $\delta \dot{\delta}$ for $\delta \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta}$ : by which the explanation of $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ovik $\dot{\alpha} \epsilon i$
 I cannot discover any sense in which it is here applicable. It seems

 de Pace § 124.
'And, "in every way practising (or studying) meanness of spirit", for studying. is a kind of increasing or promoting.' $\mu$ eोerâv being a 'kind',
 one of the four kinds of metaphor. 'To study' therefore, which is one kind of the genus 'promoting', is here put metaphorically for the general term 'to promote'. And the point of the metaphor lies in the unusual application of 'study': a man usually studies or takes pains to promote some worthy object, to cultivate some virtue: here the object is an unworthy one, a vice or defect. This is taken from Isocr. Paneg. § 151, in a note on which passage Coraes ingeniously proposed to read $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \in \tilde{\nu}$ for $a v \bar{\xi} \xi \iota \nu$ in Aristote's comment on $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \epsilon \tau a ̃$.
'And "that God kindled (lit up) reason as a light in the soul": for both of them shew something (make things clear and visible)'. This is a proportional metaphor. As light to material, so reason to intellectual objects. Cuius haec verba sunt nondum repperi, says. Victorius, and no subsequent commentator has supplied the deficiency.
'(The peaces that we make are nugatory) for we do not put an end to






wars (do away with them altogether), but merely postpone them'. This also comes from Isocr. Paneg. § 172. 'For both of them look to the future (to future results), both actual postponement (in its proper sense and application) and a peace of that kind'. This therefore is a metaphor from cidos to cioos, from one kind of postponement, to another, analogous, kind.
'And to say "that the treaty is a far fairer trophy than those which are obtained in wars: for the one is for the sake of (to commemorate) a trifling success and a single chance, but this for (on behalf of, marking the issue of,) the entire war": for both of them are signs of victory'. Isocr. Paneg. § 180, quoted by Aristotle, as Mr Sandys says in his note, memoriter. $\mu$ uâs rúxŋs is explained by Isocr. Antid. § 128. It is 'a single stroke of fortune', a mere lucky accident, as opposed to a series of successes, which prove design, skill, and knowledge. (ört, the mark of quotation). 'Again, "Cities pay a heavy reckoning (render a terrible account, for their misdeeds) to (or by ?) the censure of mankind." For the "account" or "reckoning" is a legal damage or punishment'. The explanation shews, first, (as Bernays also remarks, Dialog. des Arist. p. 16,) that єvveva here expresses not merely the account itself that is rendered, but the penalty consequent upon it, if unsatisfactory: and secondly, that the metaphor is a transfer from the legal and particular scrutiny or account rendered by the officer on laying down his command, and extended from this to an account or scrutiny in general, the penalty paid by whole cities to the judgment and censure of mankind and posterity: consequently it is a metaphor from eioos to yévos, from species to genus. The passage referred to in Bernays' treatise will furnish a com-
 val, pp. $15,16$.
cv̈gvva] This, according to some authorities, as Böckh and L. Dindorf, is the only true Attic form of the word, evitivn belonging to the later Greek. G. Dindorf writes evंध̂̂vat, Dem. Olynth. á. 17. 15, and Böckh, Publ. Econ. Bk. II, ch. 8, note 177, єviduva, єviӨvvau (p. 190 Lewis' Transl.), Schäfer (App. Crit. p. 229) note on the passage of Dem. Shilleto on Dem. de F. L. § 19, not. crit., acknowledges both plurals, evidvat

 ing. The parallel form ä́ $\mu v \nu a, u l t i o$, is cited by Phrynichus p. 23 (Lobeck) as forbidden; also by Moeris and Thomas Magister. It is however approved by Timaeus (p. 26 Ruhnken). Ruhnken in his note indignantly denies the use of the word in Plato, and refers it to the later Greek.






'And so we have despatched the subject of the pointed sayings that are derived from the proportional metaphor and by the vivid graphic language that sets things described before your eyes (presents them vividly to your mind's eye, as it were to the actual sense)'.
cipqrat] is done, and over, and enough of it. Note on I II.29.
CHAP. XI.
This chapter is in continuation of the subject of the preceding, rò
 jokes, puns, plays upon words, and verbal pleasantries of all kinds, metaphors and similes; and lastly hyperboles, which are also a kind of metaphor. All these may be employed in imparting 'vivacity' to style. Whately, Rhet. c. 3, on Style, following Aristotle, calls тò $\pi \rho \grave{̀}$ ò $\mu \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ rotêv, 'energy'. His remarks on this, partly from Aristotle, are worth comparing.
§ 1. 'We must now state what we mean by $\pi \rho o ̀ ̀ ~ o ̀ \mu \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$, and what must be done in order to give rise to this.'
§ 2. 'I mean then that things are set before our eyes by all expressions that indicate realized activity. For instance; to say that a good man is 'square' (i. e. complete) is a metaphor; for both are complete, but still don't signify a state of realized action (or activity). On the other hand, the phrase "with his vigour and prime in full bloom" (Isocr. Phil. § io) does convey the notion of life and activity, as is also, "but thee, free to roam at large" (Ib. § 127); and again, in the verse, "so thereupon the Greeks (with a rush) darting forward with the spear"' (סopi, Eur. Iph. Aul. 80: I believe the otiose $\pi 0 \sigma$ ' to be a mere misquotation of Ar.), 'the word 'darting forward' is at once life-like and metaphorical'.
ìvepyoûvta...év́́pyєcav] See ante, note on c. 10. 5. Comp. the explana-
 $\lambda_{o \nu t a}$; the representation must be life-like, the action must seem to be actually carried on before us. Poet. Xvil I. Cic. de Or. III 53. 202. Auct. ad Heren. IV 55.68. Demonstratio, quum ita verbis res exprimitur ut geri negotium et res ante oculos esse videatur: with examples. Cic. de Inv. I 54. 104, 55. 107; II 26.78. Quint. vill 3. 81. évépyeta, Ib. §89.
 See Whately's Rhetoric above referred to. This 'energy' includes Prosopopoeia or Personification : illustrated in Whately's note $\ddagger$. Demetr. $\pi$.
 section, III 1.4, on "Things animate for things lifeless."
retpáyovos comes from Simonides-or rather from the Pythagoreans, who by a square number or figure symbolized (or, as Aristotle tells us, Met. A, actually identified it with) completeness, and perfect equality in









the shape of justice. It was their type of perfection. Bergk, Fr. Lyr. Gr.


 in se ipso totus teres atque rotundus.

The second extract quoted from Isocr. Phil. § 127 requires the context to justify its selection as an example of animated style; with that, it becomes very striking. The orator is contrasting the entire freedom of view which Philip's commanding position allows him, as compared with the narrow patriotism enforced upon those who are 'fast bound' in the constitution and laws of their native cities; which he expresses by $\sigma \dot{\epsilon}$
 flight quite beyond Isocrates' ordinary range of imagination. The metaphor is of course derived from the sacred cattle which were devoted to the worship of some god, and left free from the ordinary labours of the plough and cart, to roam and graze at large in the sacred precincts, the tépevos of his temple. See Plat. Protag. 320 A, Rep. vi 498 c, and the notes of the Comm.: Aesch. Prom. Vinct. 666, 684 (Paley) and the note there (also Blomfield's Glossary, 687), Eur. Ion 822, ó f' ìv Oeoû סónotбtv


The difference between the mere metaphor rerpáyovos, and the meta| phor which also vivifies and animates, is this: in a square there is neither life nor action; in 'blooming' we have the life of a plant, in äфetov of an animal, in $\ddot{\phi} \dot{\xi}$ avres the vigour and impetuosity of living human beings.
§ 3. 'And Homer's frequent employment of the figure which invests inanimate objects with life and motion by the medium of the metaphor. But in all of them it is by representing (objects) as animated-setting them as it were in action-that he distinguishes himself (acquires his popularity, secures our approbation): in the following for instance:

 plain rolled the ruthless (remorseless) stone"' ["Downward anon to the valley the boulder remorselessly bounded"]. The animating metaphor is of course in avar $\begin{aligned} \eta \\ \text { s }\end{aligned}$, which attributes not only life, but also shameless| ness, recklessness, remorselessness, want of mercy and proper feeling, to the stone. Whately, u. s., ingeniously, but not correctly: 'provoking', mocking Sisyphus' efforts, advatồ, in the same sense, ruthless, pitiless, Soph.

каi

$$
{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \pi \tau \alpha \tau^{\prime} \dot{o} \iota \sigma \tau o ́ s,
$$

$\kappa \alpha i$

$$
\dot{\epsilon} \pi เ \pi \tau \epsilon \in \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \quad \mu \epsilon \nu \in \alpha i \nu \omega \nu
$$

$\kappa \alpha i$
 каi $\alpha i \chi \mu \eta ̀ ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \nu o t o ~ \delta \iota \epsilon ́ \sigma \sigma \nu \tau о ~ \mu \alpha \iota \mu \omega ́ \omega \sigma \alpha$.




Oed. Col. 516. aì̀os, clementia, misericordia, opposed to $\theta \rho a \sigma u s$ s, crudelis, Elmsl. ad Med. 461. This line has always been quoted as an example of "the sound an echo to the sense."
'And, "the arrow flew"-like a bird'-Hom. II. N [xiII] 587.
'And, "raging or yearning to fly to its mark"'. II. $\Delta$ [IV] I26. This attributes human feelings and passions to the arrow, ótotós. He might have added ä $\lambda$ ro in line 125.
 (more lit. 'to take their fill of flesh')'. Il. $\Lambda$ [XI] 574, Paley ad loc.
'And "the spear-point panting, quivering in its eagerness, rushed through his breast"'.

On these extracts, Whately, Rhet. u. s., note, well observes, "that there is a peculiar aptitude in some of these expressions : an arrow or dart from it flying with a spinning motion quivers violently when it is fixed; thus suggesting the idea of one quivering with eagerness". This is particularly applicable to the two last extracts. In the third, ioravto may help to convey this. The darts which fell short of their aim, struck, were fixed, in the ground, and there stood quivering. "And winged the shaft that quivered in his heart". Byron (of Kirke White), in English Bards and Scotch Reviewers. Gaisford, in Variorum not.


 eíxev. Plut. on Pyth. 398 A. See also in Heitz, Verl. Schrift. Arist. pp. 278, 9, some passages from the Schol. to Homer, and that of Plutarch, on this peculiarity of Homer.
'For in all these by reason of the living character (with which they are invested) they appear to be in action: for "shameless conduct", and "quivering with eagerness" and the rest, all express forms of activity (implying life). But these he has applied to them through the medium of the proportional metaphor, for as the stone is to Sisyphus, so is the shameless actor to him who is shamelessly treated'.

 тайтa.

 кivnбts.

## 5




I am sorry to be obliged to differ from our author in the view he here takes of the meaning of duadij's. The notion of "reckless impudence", conveyed by his equivalent divaio $\boldsymbol{x}^{\text {viros }}$, seems to me altogether alien from the Homeric conception of it. I can't think that "reckless impudence", avaucxvvria, is what Homer meant to attribute to the stone when he called it davaiof's, but 'unmerciful treatment'. At all events it is better than Pope's "huge round stone."
§ 4 'In his most approved similes too (as well as metaphors) he deals thus (employs this treatment) with inanimate things (e $\pi i$ ' in the case of' upon, applying to): "(Waves) arched, foam-crested, some in front, others (tumbling) after them"; for he draws (depicts) them all as living and moving, and living activity is a kind of motion'. Il. N [xiil] 799, ['the waves of the bellowing ocean; Bending their heads foam-crested, they sweep on, billow on billow']. The following verse will shew where



I have followed Bekker (Ed. 3) and Spengel in reading kivprts for $\mu i \mu \eta \sigma \iota s$, from a conjecture of Bekker in his first ed. $\mu i \mu \eta \sigma \sigma$ will however make good sense.
§ 5. 'Metaphors should be drawn, as has been stated before, (iII 2. 12, and 10.5, also 11.10; oixeiov in the former, $\mu \grave{\eta}$ фave $\rho \hat{v}$ implied in the words $\mu \eta^{\prime} \tau^{\prime} \dot{E} \pi \pi \pi \sigma^{\prime} \lambda a u v$, in the latter, ) from objects closely related, but not obvious to every one at first sight' (i. e. not so related, so clearly resembling one another, that no one can fail to see the resemblance at once: such metaphors do not pique the curiosity, and set people thinking; and from them you learn nothing, that you did not know before) ; 'just as in philosophy also, to observe the resemblances in widely distant things is characteristic of a sagacious penetrating intellect : like Archytas' saying, that arbitrator and altar were the same thing ; because both are the refuge of the injured or wronged' (thing or person, animal or man, expressed by the neuter).











éotiv ék фidoonфias, see the note, and references there given. On the use of resemblances and differences in defining, distinguishing, and the formation of concepts, see Trendelenburg, ad Categ. § 59 p. 137, and Sir W. Hamilton, Lectures on L.ogic, Vol. I p. 102, Lect. VI. This is the kind of 'philosophy' here referred to. Diotima's account, Pl. Symp. 2II, of the formation of general conceptions or ideas will serve as an illustration.

On Archytas, the Pythagorean philosopher and mathematician of Tarentum, see Diog. Laert. viil 4. 79-83.
' Or if one were to say that an anchor and a hook were the same : for they are both the same kind of thing, but differ in position' (lit. 'the above and below').
${ }_{k \rho є \mu \dot{\alpha}} \rho_{\rho a}$ is defined by the Schol. on Ar. Nub. 218, and by Suidas, as


 use of it for Socrates in the Clouds, u. s. But it is plain that that cannot be the meaning of it here, for it does not answer to the subsequent description of it, in respect either of the resemblance or the difference stated. Rost and Palm in their Lexicon translate it 'ankertau', the cable that holds the anchor; but this is open to precisely the same objection. It must be something in the nature of a hook, from which things may be susperded; and is literally 'a suspending instrument'. The resemblance to the anchor lies in its hooked form, and also in the intention or design of them both, which is to keep things where they are, preservation or security. The difference is that the anchor is applied to keep the vessel safe and steady at the bottom, the hook is above, and from it the thing suspended hangs. Liddell and Scott have крf $\boldsymbol{a}^{\sigma} \sigma \boldsymbol{\rho} \rho$ (the reading of three inferior MSS) with this reference, and identify it with крє $\mu \dot{\theta} \theta \rho a$ i in the Nubes.
'And the re-equalisation of cities (in the respect of property, and powers, i. e. state offices, privileges, \&c.) when the same principle is applied to (is the same for) things standing wide apart (very dissimilar', viz. to surface (area) and powers (functions, offices, prerogatives \&c.)'. The widely dissimilar things which are here brought together for comparison, are the areas of properties, and the state offices and privileges, \&c.; which are to be alike equalised. The Scholiast quoted by Vater, explains the word and its application in the same way of the equalisation of the properties, fortunes or conditions, duties and rights of the citizens of a state.


## 





бv $\mu \phi$ орबิv, all the Greek cities have been alike levelled to one condition by their misfortunes.

Vahlen has again applied his perverted ingenuity to the emend!ation of this passage. The passage wants none: it is clear in sense and construction, and the reading of the text is retained by Bekker and Spengel. In the first place, $a \nu$ in the compound verb is not a privative with $\nu$ inserted, as àvóvumos, àvázvoos, \&c., but àvá is re, of breaking up (áva入v́ctv, \&c.) for redistribution, restoring to an
 redistribute' Thuc. v 4, àvádaaros, àvąaa $\mu$ ós, de agro ex integro aequis partibus dividendo (Herod., Plat., see Ruhnken's Timaeus p. 33), àvavícev, et sim. d $\nu \omega \mu$ a $i \boldsymbol{i} \sigma \theta a t$ therefore does not denote inequality, but re-equalisation. What the signification of the word is, appears from two passages of the Polit. II 7, 1266 b 3 and c. 12, 1274 b 9. In the first of these
 and -oîv respectively. They both refer to the same thing, viz. Phaleas of Chalcedon's scheme for the equalisation or re-equalisation of properties, and plainly, except perhaps so far as the dáá is concerned, have precisely the same signification : and this is perfectly applicable here. Vahlen
 jection to $d_{\nu} \mu_{\mu \lambda i} \sigma_{i a}$ seems to me to be entirely unfounded, and I can see no reason whatever for altering the text. There is another slight alteration proposed, which is not worth mentioning.
èmıф́ávea is a surface, here area; and in Euclid, a plane figure, which $\dagger$ has only length and breadth, a superficies.
§ 6. This introduces a new topic of doreia, things pointed and lively, in the sense of witticisms, things amusing and laughable, such as jokes $\pi a \rho$ ' úróvoav, or $\pi a \rho a ̀$ à $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \delta o \kappa i a v$, repartees, puns, plays upon words, and the like.
'Though it is true in general that most of these 'vivacities' are conveyed by ( $\delta \dot{\text { cá }}$ ) metaphor, yet they are also derived from (a temporary, momentary) delusion (leading to a pleasing surprise at the unexpected supplement): for it becomes clearer (to the listener) that he has learnt something from (the conclusion of the sentence) being contrary' to his expectation-or, as Victorius, from his own contrary, i.e. changed, state of mind, which has arisen between the beginning and end of the sentence-'and the soul seems to say to herself, "Really, so it is ; and I missed it (never found it out till now)"'. (This explanation of the pleasure derived from the unexpected surprise,-that the previous deception heightens the pleasure of the acquired knowledge-is due, I I think, rather to the theory which had become habitual with Ar., that all intellectual pleasure is due to the natural desire of learning, than to



 фора́. каi ò $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota$ Өєódшроs, тò каıvà $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota$.


his sober judgment exercised upon this particular application of it.) Schrader has supplied two capital instances of this form of pleasantry: the first is from Tic. de Or. II 281, Quid huic abest-nisi res et virtus? Here the listener is misled by the opening of the sentence to expect a very good character of somebody, when unexpectedly, after a pause, two words are added as exceptions, which convert the expected eulogium into beggary and worthlessness : but is it the learning, the becoming acquainted with that fact, however unexpectedly, that constitutes the pleasure or amusement that the listener derives from his surprise? A still better from Quint. of a dandy advocate, illud Afri "homo in agendis causis optimevestitus," for the expected versatus ${ }^{1}$, Quint. vi 3. 24 and 84 . This topic he calls, decipiendi opinionem. He returns to it again in VIII 5.15 under the name of ex inopinato: and gives two examples. Sic. de Or. 1163.255;70.284, locus prater expectationem. I have quoted two or three English ones in the note to Introd. p. 319, note 3.
'And the apophthegms that have point and vivacity derive this character from the indirect statement of the meaning (from the speaker's not directly expressing the intended meaning), as that of Stesichorus "that their cicalas will have to sing to themselves from the ground"' all the trees being cut down and the land devastated; which is the real, direct, meaning: and iavrois, that there will be no one else to listen
 Stesichorus' apophthegm also appears in Demetr. $\pi$. $\varepsilon \rho \mu$. § 99 where it is attributed to Dionysius (the tyrant; as a threat); and $\S 243$, as an example of $\beta \rho a \chi \nu \lambda$ coria in the chapter on $\boldsymbol{\delta \epsilon}$ เvórŋs. This is a riddle in the shape of an apophthegm : the next topic brings us to aenigmas proper. The pleasure derived from these is traced, as usual, to that of learning: and against that explanation in the present instance I have no objection to make.
' And for the same reason, riddles well wrapped up give pleasure: for not only is this (viz. the solution of them) a kind of learning, but they are also expressed in metaphor. And what Theodorus calls "novel phrases, expressions." This is effected (this novelty, this surprise) when (the sequel) is unexpected, and not, to use his own words, "according to previous opinion or expectation"; but, as is the custom of humorous,
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 jocular writers, who alter the letters of words to make jokes'. I have given a free transl. of the last clause; with oi iv rois $\gamma$ ydoiots understand


пaparotein ${ }^{1}$ is, as I have pointed out in Introd. p. 320, the general name for all falsification ( $\pi$ afá) or (illicit) changes of the letters of words,
 sion, misapplication, of a word: all jokes that depend upon verbal or literal changes. Compare $\pi$ aрávvpos and its congeners, in logic and
 See further, Introd., u. s., note I.

On Theodorus of Byzantium, see note on II 23. 28, ult. and the references there given.
'Which is the effect also of literal jokes (founded upon the letters and the changes of them); for these also cheat (the expectation, and so far mislead). (This kind of joke is not confined to prose: it appears) also in verses. For (the conclusion) is not as the hearer (the listener to the recitation of a rhapsodist) supposed: "and he trod with his-chilblains under his feet" (statelily stept he along, and under his feet were his-chilblains)-whereas the other thought he was going to say "sandals". This $\pi a \rho \grave{a}$ रןa $\mu \mu \grave{a} ~ \sigma \kappa \hat{\omega} \mu \mu a$, which must be taken from some burlesque hexameter poem-author unknown-has its counterpart in Arist. Vesp.
 Schol. ad h. 1. (in Gaisford's Not. Var.) refers, as another instance, to




 de Cor.
'Pleasantries arising from changes of letters (plays on words) are produced, not by a mere enunciation of a word in its direct meaning, but by something (a change) which gives a different turn to it, (converts or twists it into a different sense); as that of Theodorus (of Byzantium, the rhetorician: supra, II 23.28), against Nicon the harper, $\theta$ páreet: he pretends namely to say "it confounds you" (you are confounded), and cheats; for he means something else: and therefore it is amusing only after one has become acquainted with the meaning (or circumstances);
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1 om.
for if (the hearer) doesn't know that he is a Thracian, he will see no ' point in it at all'. -Victorius and Schrader have both missed the meaning of this pun. But in order to arrive at it, we must first remove from the text the first $\sigma \in$ after $\theta \rho$ árret which has been introduced from the second (where it is required) and spoils the pun. Nicon, it appears from the explanation, is, or is supposed to be, of foreign extraction; and not only that, but a Thracian, the most barbarous of all nations. The Thracian women were habitually slaves, in Athenian families: Arist. Thesm. 279, 280, 284, 293, Pac. 1138, Vesp. 828. This person is addressed by Theodorus with the word $\theta$ oárre,, which means apparently, "You are confounded"; this appears from the interpretation that follows, (rt) Apátrєt $\sigma \epsilon$, which is of course convertible in meaning with the passive Opártet (and it follows also that the first $\sigma \in$ must be an error of the transcriber, for $\theta \rho a ́ r \tau \epsilon \iota ~ \sigma \epsilon$ would be no interpretation of $\theta \rho a ́ r \tau \epsilon \iota \sigma \epsilon ;$ nor in that form would there be any pun). It really means, however, Өpârr' el, "You are a Thracian maid-servant", not only an out-and-out barbarian, but effeminate to boot, and a menial. Schrader's explanation is " Өрárтŋ (sic) $\sigma \epsilon$, hoc est, Thracia mulier te, intellige peperit:" at once impossible in respect of the Greek, and pointless. Victorius, to much the same effect.

The amusement derived from a pun is thus explained by Cicero, de Or. II 62. 254, Ambiguum (double-entendre) per se ipsum probatur id quidem, ut ante dixi, vel maxime; ingeniosi enim videtur vim verbi in aliud atque ceteri accipiant passe ducere; sed admirationem mages quai risum movet, nisi si quando incidit in aliud genus ridicule.
ßoú入єt aủzò̀ $\boldsymbol{\pi \epsilon ́ \rho \rho a t ] ~ N o ~ s a t i s f a c t o r y ~ e x p l a n a t i o n ~ h a s ~ h i t h e r t o ~ b e e n ~}$ given of this pun. The point of the joke has been always supposed to lie in $\pi$ é $\rho \sigma a t$. Francésco deli Medici, a friend of Vettori, suggested to him a solution which he quotes at length, that the Perse a poem of Timotheus is referred to, and that we should read Hépaus. But as Buhle justly remarks, "non video quidnam in hoc sit faceti." Majoragius' explanation, who supposes that there was a verb Hépoetv, of the same meaning as M M $i$ isctv, Persis favere, is equally out of the question. I have looked (for once) into Spengel's commentary, and find that he has suggested an analogy with Horace's win tu curtis Iudacis oppedere, Sat. I 9.70. The same thought once occurred to me, but I abandoned it, in consideration of the form of the word, $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \sigma a u$; which, though a possible aorist, is entirely without authority. $\pi \epsilon \in \delta \delta \mu a t$ is a dep. and has жaporíopal for its future, ënapdov for the aorist. The solution I have finally arrived at is that the alteration of letters which makes the pun, resides in $\beta$ ovine.. This would probably be pronounced nearly, if not quite, like $\beta o u \lambda \eta$, and the word could be rendered 'will you?' or 'the Council': in the







 latter sense the words would mean 'may the council destroy him.' Sed de his nugis iam satis est.
§ 7. 'But both of them' (either the two last examples of $\pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \gamma \rho a ́ \mu \mu a ;$ or that topic itself and the preceding, mapà mpordoxiav: they all require the same precaution) 'must be properly pronounced' (or delivered-attention must be called to the rapà $\pi \rho o \sigma \delta o \kappa i a v$, by a slight pause, and to the double-entendre by heightening the tone or some similar expedient).
 sentence to enable us to determine their meaning. Victorius understands it, "tanquam in $\sigma \kappa \dot{\omega} \mu \mu a \sigma \iota \nu$ et iocis amarioribus, ita in urbanis hisce sermonibus": but Ar. makes no such distinction : all the jokes mapa


 and begins a new topic : a most unnatural interpretation as it seems to me. In default of any thing better I propose the following :-
' And so likewise witticisms, pointed sayings in general (as distinguished from the two special varieties, or two particular instances preceding), (require the same attention to pronunciation), as to say that " to the Athenians the command of the sea was not the beginning (both expressed by the same word, $\boldsymbol{d}^{\boldsymbol{j}} \boldsymbol{\chi} \boldsymbol{\chi} \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu$ ) of their misfortunes"; for they derived benefit from it' (it was the source not of evil, but of good). Or, as Isocrates puts it, that "the command was to the city the beginning (or source) of her calamities." This, or something like it, occurs three times in Isocrates. The two similar places, one a mere repetition of the other, Phil. § 6i, and de Pace § ror, are probably what Ar. had (very imperfectly) in his recollection : the third is, Paneg. § 119, which differs more widely from the quotation.
' For in both (these cases, or examples) that is said which one would not suppose likely to be said by any one, (lit. which one would not suppose that any one, rıva, would say) and (yet, at the same time) is recognised as true (sound, in accordance with facts, Victorius, see III 7.9, infra § 10) : for though it is true that there is nothing particularly clever in calling the command a beginning, (in calling ápx ${ }^{\dot{\eta}}{ }^{\dot{\alpha}} \rho \chi \dot{\eta}$, though in different senses), still he uses the term not in the same, but in different senses, (in the second example, Vahlen), and does not contradict (or deny) the use of $\dot{a} \rho \chi{ }^{\dot{\eta}}$ (in the first example), only in a different sense'. The second example, from Isocrates, may seem at first sight to








contradict the first, what is affirmed in the one being denied in the other. But if allowance be made for the double sense of $\boldsymbol{a}^{\prime} \rho \chi \eta^{\prime}$, the apparent discrepancy between the two statements will disappear.
§ 8. 'But in all these cases, the merit ( $\boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{ev}^{\boldsymbol{v}}$ ) consists in the proper application of the term (i.e. the appropriateness of it to the thing described), whether by (expressed in) ambiguity (the play on words) or

'For instance " Intolerable Tolerable"-the contradiction lies only in the ambiguity; but this is appropriate if the owner of the name is a bore (or nuisance)'. Read with Bekker and Spengel 'Àárðøeros oùk
 proper name; as 'Tolerable' must be supposed to be in the English version. $\dot{\delta} \mu \omega \nu \nu \mu i a \nu \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \phi \quad{ }^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ ' the speaker contradicts the ambiguous word only'; not the thing itself: the application, not the fact. These contradictory, or privative, epithets of proper names-comp. the privative epithets of metaphors, III 6.7 and note-may be exemplified in our own language by ruthless Ruth, helpless Helps, fearless Phear, inconstant Constance, unpleasant Pleasance, ignoble Noble, Hotspur cold-spor, and the like. Significant Greek names are to be found in II 23. 29, III 15.8 ; Latin in Quint. VI 3.55. Others are "Avektos (which is pre-
 Il. A p. 156-but in fact most Greek proper names are significant in themselves, though they may have lost the appropriateness of their personal application.
'And, "never make thyself as a stranger, more of a stranger than is required of thee", "not more than thou art bound to do"; the same thing (in different words)'. As the words are not different, but the same, Vahlen ${ }^{1}$ very reasonably proposes to omit $\sigma \epsilon \delta \in i$ in the Iambic verse,
 ov่ $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon$ סє $\hat{i}$ is now differently expressed, and becomes what it is said to be, an explanation; or the expression of the same thing in different words. Victorius thinks that one of the two may mean 'host' or 'guest'; but as $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ '́vos is not repeated in the alternative, Vahlen's explanation seems more probable. 'And, (in a third way) "a stranger must not be always a stranger" (or, strange) : for that too is again of
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 a different kind, or form', (foreign, alien, to the two others : à $\lambda \lambda$ ótptov belonging to something or somebody else; opposed to oikeiov).
' Of the same kind is also that so highly praised verse of Anaxandrides, "A noble thing it is to die ere doing aught worthy of death": for this is the same as saying, "It is worthy to die when one is not worthy to die", or "it is a worthy thing to die when one does not deserve death", or "doing nothing worthy of death"'. Anaxandrides is quoted III 10.7 (see note) and infra 12.3.
§ 9. 'Now of all these the kind of expression (language) is the
 $\mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu$ from the compar. èáтrovı: I have represented the similar ellipse which our own language makes in the like case), 'so much the more are they popular (approved, applauded). The reason of this is, that to the antithesis is due the increase, and by the brevity (in a short time, $\chi \rho o ́ \nu \varphi$, or space, compass, rón $\varphi$, the more rapid growth (or acquisition) of the learning (that arises from them)'. Comp. notes on III.21, 23, and III g.8, also 10.2 .
§ 10. '(To make a phrase ioreiov) it should always have (attached to it, $\pi \rho o \sigma \in i ̂ v a l$ ) some special personal application (ró tıva civat $\pi \rho o ̀ s$ ö̀ $\lambda_{\text {е́ }} \boldsymbol{\prime} \in \tau a t$ ), or propriety in the expression if what is said (is to) be true and not superficial' (supra c. 10.5).
$\left.{ }^{\boldsymbol{a}} \lambda_{\eta} \theta^{\prime}{ }_{\text {'s }}\right]$ i.e. sound, solid, substantial, genuine, comp. III 7.9, sententiam gravem et honestam, Victorius. Metiri se quemque suo modulo ac pede verum est. Hor. Ep. I. 7, ult. also I 12.23, "et saepe ap. Livium."
 always go together: when they are separated, the sentence loses its point and attraction. This separation is illustrated by two examples : the first, as a-sentiment, has truth, weight, and solidity; the second is well enough written, as far as the style goes; but neither of them is particularly attractive.
' Because these two may be separated in a sentence: for instance, "a man should die free from all offence"-but there is no point











in that: "the worthy man should marry the worthy woman""-but there is no point in that (this is superficial): but if they are both combine in the sentence (then only the sentence becomes pointed). "It is a worthy thing (or worth while) for a man to die when unworthy of death (when he has done nothing to deserve death)." Here we have the grave, sound, true doctrine, and the antithesis, which gives it point, and redeems it from superficiality. 'But the greater the proportion of these qualities, the more pointed and attractive it appears ; if, for instance, the (individual) words also were to convey (emit) a metaphor, and a metaphor of a particular kind (the proportional met. for example), and antithesis, and balanced clauses, and to carry with them vividness and animation'. On ivépréta, see above § i.
§ iI. 'Similes too, as has been already said in the preceding (chapter, c. 4), are always in a certain sense popular metaphors. For they are always composed of (or, expressed in) two terms, just like the propertional metaphor ; as for instance, the shield, we say, is Ares' goblet', (the shape of the $\phi \dot{a}^{\prime} \eta \eta$ is in reality more like an elongated saucer, or shieldwhence the comparison), 'and a bow a stringless harp. When thus expressed, the phrase is not single (or simple ; it has both terms expressed, the two terms viz. that are brought into comparison; and is therefore a simile); whereas to call the bow a harp or the shield a goblet is single'
 ai." Stengel.]

The meaning seems to be this. The difference between a simile and a metaphor is-besides the greater detail of the former, the simile being a metaphor writ large-that it always distinctly expresses the two terms that are compared, bringing them into apparent contrast : the metaphor on the other hand, substituting by transfer the one notion for the other of the two compared, identifies them as it were in one image, and expresses both in a single word, leaving the comparison between
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the object illustrated, and the analogous notion which throws a new light upon it, to suggest itself from the manifest correspondence to the hearer.

On the фıád $\eta$ "Apeos, see note on III 4.4, and Introd. pp. 220-292, there referred to. This was due to Timotheus the dithyrambic poet. The $\phi_{0} \rho \mu \mu \gamma \xi{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \chi o \rho \delta o s$ for tógov-the point of resemblance which brings the two together seems to be the common twang of the bowstring and harp-string produced in each case by the vibration of the string. The bow may therefore be called a stringless harp, as wanting the many strings of the musical instrument, or, in other words, an unmusical harp. On these privative epithets with metaphors, comp. III 6.7. The author of this last bit of dorecórŋs is a tragic poet named Theognis, mentioned with contempt and ridicule three times by Aristophanes, Acharn. 11 , and 138 , and Thesm. $168 . \mathrm{He}$ is said to have received the nickname of $\chi เ \omega^{\nu}$ from his excessive $\psi v \chi \rho o ́ r \eta s$. Of all his writings only this one phrase has survived, preserved by Demetrius, $\pi$. $\dot{\varepsilon} \rho \mu \eta$ $\nu e i ́ a s, \pi . \mu \epsilon \tau a \phi o p a ̂ s, ~ § 85$. He gives the author's name, and cites this as


 III 100, and the writer of the article Theognis No. II in Biog. Dict., have

§ 12. 'The simile is made in this way, by comparing for instance a flute-player to an ape'-Simia quam similis, turpissima bestia nobis [Ennius, ap. Cic. de Nat. Deor. I § 97]: besides this general resemblance of the two natures, there is also a special resemblance between the two, thus described by Victorius, "quod tibicines quoque ut simiae contracto corpore, manibusque ad os appositis, cum tibias inflant, ut bestia illa sedent." The resemblance is quite sufficient to justify the simile.

In the next example we must (with Bekker and Spengel) read, after MS A ${ }^{0}, \lambda \mathcal{u}^{\chi} \nu \varphi[$ not $\lambda \dot{u} \kappa \varphi$ ], and omit $\epsilon$ is.
'And a short-sighted man to a lamp with water dropping upon it'. The involuntary contraction, the convulsive winking, of the half-closed eyes of the short-sighted man is compared to the fizzing, spirting, and sputtering of the lamp when water is dropped on it: 'because both are contracted'. $\mu \dot{v} \omega \psi$ ( $\mu \dot{v} \epsilon \iota \nu$ ) is one that keeps his eyes half shut, Probl.
 point of the comparison lie in the contraction of both, the eyelids and the flame. $\psi a k a ́ s ~ o r ~ \psi \in \kappa a ́ s ~ ' a ~ d r o p ' ; ~ \psi a k a ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu ~ ' t o ~ d r o p, ~ f a l l ~ i n ~ d r o p s ', ~$









once, in large measures. The other is to distribute your potations in 'drops', as it were, in very small glasses ; and so to make up for what you lose in the magnitude of the draught by the frequent repetition of the little one.
§ 13. 'Excellence is attained in them when they contain (involve) metaphor (comp. c. 10 § 3): for the shield may be compared to "Ares' goblet", and a ruin to the "rag of a house"'; [conversely we have rags described as ípeitia $\chi^{\lambda a v i} \delta i \omega \nu$, Soph. Fragm. (Niobe) 400, comp. Eur. Troad. 1025.]
'And Niceratus may be said to be "a Niceratus stung by Pratys"- Phdrolh. according to Thrasymachus' simile, when he saw Niceratus after his defeat by Pratys in the rhapsodical contest, and still all dishevelled and dirty (squalid)'; with the marks of the long and laborious struggle still fresh upon him; before he had had time to shave and dress. кo $\mu \hat{a} \nu$ is here used in the unusual sense of long hair as a sign of neglect, incomtis capillis, uncombed, unkempt $:$ in the ordinary acceptation long hair is a sign of foppery, or the distinctive mark of a young man of fashion, Arist. Eq. 580, except at Sparta, Rhet. I 9.26, where it was a
 the Homeric ages, when the Achaeans were карпконо́шнтеs.

Of the many Niceratuses whose names appear in Sauppe's Ind. Nom. ad Or. Att. p. ioz, there are two better known to us than the rest, (1) the son of the distinguished Athenian general, who appears as one of the guests in Xenophon's banquet, in Lysias, \&c., and was put to death by the Thirty tyrants. If the Thrasymachus who made the remark upon him be-as he doubtless is-the famous Sophist, this must be the Niceratus who is here meant. The second, mentioned in Dem. c. Mid. § 165, and afterwards in a list of witnesses with the name of his deme ' $\Lambda \boldsymbol{\chi} \in \rho-$ dovocos, $\S 168$, was probably the grandson of the other ; for the names of Nicias and Niceratus seem to have alternated in successive generations in this family, as they did in that of Callias and Hipponicus. These two are habitually confounded by Taylor, Reiske (see his Ind. ad Dem.) and others; and the confusion still exists in Smith's Biographical Dictionary, although Buttmann proved their diversity (in Exc. viII ad Dem. c. Mid.). Sauppe likewise, in his Ind. Nom. ad Or. Att. p. 102, distinguishes them. Several other Niciases and Niceratuses appear in Sauppe's Index, u. s.

Niceratus had engaged in a contest with one Pratys, a professional rhapsodist, and, being in all probability an amateur, had been defeated. In this state, and still bearing all the marks of it on his person, he is




 $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha ф о \rho \alpha i, \epsilon^{\prime} \rho \eta \tau \alpha \iota \pi о \lambda \lambda \alpha$ кєєs.
encountered by Thrasymachus, who thereupon compares him to "a Philoctetes bitten or stung by Prates." Schneider on Ken. Sympos. III 5 supposes that "the subject of the recitation in which Niceratus was beaten was the account in Lesches' 'little Iliad' of the story of Philoctetes in which was related the calamity arising from the serpent's bite; alluded to by Homer, Il. B 721 "; and by Soph. Phil. 267, $\pi \lambda \eta \gamma^{e} \boldsymbol{e r t}$

'Wherein the poets are most condemned when they fail, and applaided when they succeed'. iкkinteiv is properly said of an actor who is hissed off the stage, and hence of condemnation, disapproba-


 ea quai reiiciuntur et repudiantur ; Stallbaum). explodi, exactus, Ter. Prob. (2) Hes. 4 et 7. The opposite of the agent is $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \beta$ aid $\lambda_{\epsilon \epsilon \nu}$ ' to hiss off the stage'; Dem. de F. L. $\S 389$ (of Aeschines again, as acting Thyestes),

' I mean when they make (the two members) correspond (bring into
 parsley." (oủdos, Buttmann Lexil. No. 44 and 88). "Like Philammon, at close quarters with the sack"'. Philammon, a famous Athenian athlete, gained the prize at the Olympian games, Dem. de Cor. § 319.

Harpocr. $\Phi$. т̀̀v 'AӨךンaîov пúктๆv. Eustath. ad Home. Il. $\psi$ p. 1324, quoted in Dissen's note on Dem. l. c.
§ryoцахєiv] of a close struggle, desperate encounter, prop. of two oxen under the yoke, or of any yoke-fellows. Ruhnken ad Tim. s. v.

 for the young, and sand for the more robust, and then suspended at a certain height, and swung backwards and forwards by the players.' Dict. Ant. art. 'Baths,' p. 144 b. It is evident that this describes only one use of it, namely for amusement or exercise at the baths: this game was called кшрикодахіа. The other purpose for which it was employed was plainly from this passage that of boxers, who practised upon it. [Compare Plautus, Rudens 722, follem pugilatorium faciam et pendentern incursabo pugnis, and see K. F. Hermann's Privatalterthiumer, § 37. 17.]

These two iambic lines, from unknown authors, are clearly selected not for the failure, but the success, of the poet or poets who composed them.
'(These) and the like are all similes. That all similes are (a kind of, or involve) metaphors, has been stated already many times'.

14 каi ai $\pi \alpha \rho о \iota \mu i ́ \alpha i ~ \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha ф о \rho \alpha i ~ \alpha ’ \pi ' ~ \epsilon i ́ d o u s ~ \epsilon ̇ \pi ' ~ \epsilon i ́ d o s ~$





§ 14. 'Proverbs too are metaphors from species to species: as for instance, if a man has of his own accord invited the aid of (lit. called in to help him) another in the expectation of deriving benefit (from his assistance), and then incurs harm and loss instead, as the Carpathian says of the hare : for each of them is a case of the accident (or result) above mentioned'.

Carpathus, an island lying between Crete and Rhodes, from which the neighbouring sea took the name of Carpathian (Hor. Carn. I 35. 8) : now called Skarpanto. The proverb is thus explained by Buhle. "Cum Carpathi incolae leporibus carerent, unus eorum par leporum introduxit" (rabbits, doubtless), "unde tanta eorum multitudo propter faecunditatem exorsa est, ut omnes fructus absumerentur." Erasmus, Adag. Chil. II Cent. I 81, p. 1250.

A similar result follows from similar conduct in Stesichorus' fable of the stag, the horse, and the man, 1120.5 . These are both species of the same genus of disappointed expectation, or disastrous result : and the proverb is a transfer, a tralatio of the one to the other. On the four kinds of metaphor, see Poet. XxI 7.
'So the sources of witticisms and pointed, pungent, vivid things in general, and the rcason why (they are such; their raison d'être), have been pretty well explained'. I have omitted tò aïrov as a mere tautological repetition of 8ıótı. On the three senses of 8tórı see note on 1 i.if. Here the sense of "why" is proved by the explanatory тò aitıov.
§ 15. 'All approved hyperboles are also metaphors', i. e. a mere hyperbola, without metaphor, will not be approved. On the hyperbole, Auct. ad Heren. IV 33. 44, superlatio est oratio superans veritatern alicuius augendi minuendive causa, et seq. Cic. Topic. c. x § 45, aut aliquid quod fieri mullo modo possit augendae rei gratia dicatur, aut minuendae, quae hyperbole dicitur. Quint. vili 6.67-76, Hyperbolen audacioris ornatus summo loco posui. Est haec decens veri superiectio. Virtus eius ex diverso par augendi atqueminuendi. Then follow the description and illustration of its several varieties. In Ernesti, Lex. Techr. (both Greek and Latin), hyperbole is omitted. $\dot{\boldsymbol{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \beta o \lambda \eta}$ is in fact 'exaggeration'. 'For instance (what was said) to (or against, for the purpose of exaggeration, making the most of it) the man with the black eye, "you'ld have taken him for a basket of mulberries". For the black eye ${ }^{1}$ is something red' (and so is the mulberry; the colour is similar; and
 the seat of that, the part that is under the eye. It is thence transferred to the signification of the discoloured surface that results from a blow under the eye (in $\omega$ -





 ри́кш.



therefore so far it is a metaphor from one red thing-purple is nearer to the true colour-to another, eidos $\pi \rho$ os eidos); 'but the hyperbole or exaggeration' ( $\sigma \phi \dot{0} \delta \rho a$, which distinguishes it from metaphor) 'lies in the excessive quantity', (i. e. in the absurdly exaggerated number of black spots represented by a whole basket of mulberries. Victorious). According to Theophrastus, de Caus. Plant. vi 6. 4, there are two kinds of mulberries, red and white, épv $\theta \rho \dot{\partial} \nu$ kali $\lambda \epsilon v \kappa o ́ v . ~ T h i s ~ i s ~ a n ~ i n s t a n c e ~ o f ~ Q u i n-~$ tilian's first variety of hyperbole; quum plus facto dicimus, direct exaggeration; of which two examples are given. Victorius refers to the
 $\pi \epsilon \pi a \sigma \mu \epsilon \dot{\nu} \nu \nu$, "Sulla (i. e. his face) is like a mulberry powdered with flour", in Plutarch [Sulla, c. 2, p. 451 F].
'And another (kind of phrase) like so and so' (comp. tà kail tá, infra c. 17. 11; this seems to mean the two preceding examples, which are here repeated, and others like them) 'is a hyperbole, differing from it merely by the form of the expression (it becomes a hyperbole by dropping the particle of comparison, $\left.\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \rho\right)$. Thus "like Philammon at close quarters with the sack", (may be thrown into the form of a hyperbole, thus,) "you would have taken him for Philammon fighting the sack". Again, "to wear his legs curly like parsley", becomes "you'ld have thought his legs not legs, but parsley, so crooked are they"'. This is Quintilian's second variety of hyperbole, u. s. § 68, superiectio per similitudinem, ant per comparationem: illustrated by Credas innare revalas Cycladas, Virg. An. viIi 691.
§ 16. 'The hyperbole has a juvenile character, signifying vehemence: and therefore they are most used by people when they are angry ; "No, not if he were to offer me gifts as the sand or dust for multitude" (or gifts in number like the sand or dust). "And the daughter of Agamemnon
$\pi(\alpha \sigma \mu \delta s)$-the special for the general- $\dot{v} \pi \omega \pi\llcorner\alpha\} \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ being to 'strike, or inflict a blow
 colouration. See for exemplifications of all three, Arist. Pax 54I, Acharn. 55 I, Vest. 1386. Fragm. Apolloph. r. Vol. in 880, Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr., кúaOov




## 

 кои́р $\eta \nu$ ס' ova' $\gamma \alpha \mu \epsilon ́ \omega ~ ' A \gamma \alpha \mu \epsilon ́ \mu \nu o v o s ~ ' A \tau \rho \epsilon i ́ \delta a o, ~$




son of Atreus will I not wed, no, not though she vied in beauty with golden Aphrodite, and in accomplishments [deftness of handiwork] with Athene"', comp. III 7. II. Il. I [IX] 385 (the angry Achilles indignantly: refusing Agamemnon's offered presents). رetpakiódets is here meant to convey the fire, vigour, spirit, impetuosity, proneness to passion and ${ }^{\prime}$ excitement ; or in general 'vehemence', as he tells us; which are characteristic of early youth. It is used by Plato [Rep. 466 B , and 498 B ] in the sense of 'puerile'. The latter usually represents this by $\nu \in a v c k o ́ s$, which he uses in two opposite senses, of the good and bad qualities of youth ; either gallant, spirited, generous, noble, splendid and such like, or rash, wanton, insolent : also veavias and veavıev́єo $\theta a$.
'This figure is an especial favourite with the Attic orators'.
'And this is why the use of it is unbecoming to an elderly man' not because, as might be supposed from the arrangement of the sentences, it was such a favourite with the Attic orators but-because it is a juvenile trait of character, and as such must be inappropriate to the opposite.
[It may be doubted whether the awkward remark, $\chi \rho \omega \hat{\nu \tau a \iota} \boldsymbol{\delta e ̀} \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$ ]
 ceeding another parenthesis and breaking the connexion between the; beginning and the end of the section, was really written by Aristotle at, all. The phrase of 'Artıkol pin 'ropes, which is not found elsewhere in
 open to suspicion, and may perhaps be ascribed to the pen of some Alexandrine critic familiar with the canon of the Ten 'Attic Orators'.]

## CHAP. XII.

We now return for the last time to the subject of propriety of style, on which in this chapter we have some concluding observations. Retorical propriety must shew itself in the due adaptation of style to matter ; and consequently the three branches of Rhetoric must be treated each in its appropriate style. We therefore distinguish two kinds of speeches, and two styles appropriate to them ; (1) 'debate', speaking in the actual strife or contest of the assembly and the law-court, a jo


$\nu \iota \sigma \tau \iota \times \dot{\eta} \lambda_{\epsilon} \xi \iota \iota$ ，and（2）$\gamma \rho a \phi \iota \kappa \eta \dot{\eta}$ ，written compositions，which are confined to the third or epideictic branch ：and the first is again subdivided into （a）public speaking，popular harangues addressed to the assembly，and （b）forensic．This is only true in theory ：in practice speeches were often written by the orators，as Demosthenes and Isocrates，for the use of those who were incompetent or unwilling to write and plead for them－ selves．

Under the head of $\gamma \rho a \phi \iota \times \dot{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \in \xi \iota s$ are included all compositions which are intended to be read，and consequently the whole range of literature， with the exception of speeches which are intended to be delivered or acted，deliberative and forensic，public and private orations－such as those of Demosthenes．Thus the third branch of Rhetoric，the $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi t-$ $\mid \delta_{\epsilon \iota \kappa T \iota \kappa \eta}$ ，is made to embrace all poetry，philosophy，history，and indeed any writing on any subject whatsoever．The distinction coincides with
 Rhet．Gr．II．p． 401 seq．Spengel），who divides composition into 入óyou
 Homer and Plato，the most distinguished of poets and prose writers．

The declamations delivered at the Olympian Games and other great pablic festivals or assemblies mavuyúpets，whence the name mavquvoıui $\lambda_{\text {óyot－such as Isocrates＇Panegyric }}{ }^{1}$ and Panathenaic orations，and Lysias＇celebrated＇Oגvurtakós，of which a short fragment is preserved， （Or．33，Baiter et Sauppe，Or．Att．I 146）－were intermediate between the public or agonistic and the epideictic or graphic speeches，partaking of the character of both；being declaimed in public and sometimes with a political object（as Lysias＇speech，and some of Isocrates＇），but that object was subordinate，the main consideration being always the display．Iso－ crates is always anxious to impress his readers with the conviction that his speeches are not mere empty declamations， $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \iota \delta \in i \xi \epsilon \iota \mathcal{s}$ ，but genuine $\pi 0 \lambda_{1}-$ rixol $\lambda$ dóyot－are indeed a branch of Philosophy，which with him is pretty nearly convertible with Rhetoric，see кarà rồ $\sigma 0 \phi \iota \sigma \tau \omega \hat{\nu}$ §§ I，11，21，and Mr Sandys＇note on Paneg．§ io．［＇Isocrates means by＂Philosophy＂a combination of the accomplishments of the $\dot{\rho} \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \rho$ and the $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa o ́ s '$. Thompson＇s Phaedrus，p．172．］

Isocrates，writing from his point of view，dutid．§§ 46－50，contrasts
 tıkov̀s kaì mavŋyvpıkoús，with סıкavıroì 入óyot，forensic pleading and plead－ ers，whom，probably in consequence of his own failure in that branch of Rhetoric，he attacks and vituperates upon intellectual，social，and moral grounds．Writing before the establishment of Aristotle＇s three－ fold division of the art，he evidently recognises only two branches， public or political speaking，in which national interests are concerned－ and at the head of these he places his own mavךүupıкoi $\lambda$ óyot，the true philosophy（§ 50）－and judicial or forensic，in which private interests

[^14]
## ßoú $\lambda \eta \tau \alpha \iota \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \delta o u ̂ \nu \alpha \iota ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \iota s$, ő $\pi \epsilon \rho \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \chi o v \sigma \iota \nu$


between man and man are debated and decided. In respect of style, he of course gives the preference to his own kind of composition, $\S \$ 46,7$.

On this adaptation of style to the different kinds of oratory, see Quint. viil 3. II-14. The opening observation, at all events, looks like a reference to this chapter, though Spalding in his note is silent on the subject.

Whately also, in his Rhet. c. iv 'on Elocution', (Encycl. Metrop. p. $299 b, 300 a, 301 b$,) has some good observations, partly derived from Aristotle, upon the contrast of the agonistic and graphic styles. On the contrast of the two, see by all means Isocr. Phil. $\$ 825,26$ : all the main points of interest in public and forensic, or agonistic, speeches are there enumerated, and the comparatively lifeless speeches to be read, forcibly contrasted with them. [Comp. also Alcidamas, $\pi \in \rho i ̀$ tôv rò̀s $\gamma \rho a \pi \tau o u ̀ s$入óyous ypaфóvrav, (against Isocrates).]
§ I. 'It must not be forgotten (lost sight of) that a different kind of language is appropriate to each different kind (of Rhetoric). For the same style is not suitable to written composition (that which is intended to be read) and that which is used in debate (in the contests, the actual struggle, of real life; nor again in (the two divisions of the latter) public and forensic speaking. The orator must be acquainted with both : for the one (debate) implies the knowledge and power of clear expression in pure Greek, and the other freedom from the necessity (lit. the not being obliged to) of suppressing in silence (kará, keeping down) anything that one may want to communicate to the rest of the world; which is the case with those who have no knowledge (or skill) of writing (i.e. composition)'. Comp. III 1.7. Cicero, de Or. II 82.337, gives a brief description of the 'grand' and dignified style appropriate to the exalted subjects of public speaking.

The meaning of this seems to be-the orator must be acquainted with the written as well as the debating style; the latter implies and requires only the correct use of one's native language, so that one may be able to make oneself clearly intelligible : this (debate alone) does not require the minute accuracy of studied composition, which can be examined at leisure and criticized: but since one who can only speak, and not write, is incapable of communicating his opinions to the rest of the world (roîs ä̀ $\lambda \lambda$ ots, all others besides the members of the assembly or law-court that he is actually addressing), it is necessary for a statesman to acquire the power of writing well, and therefore to study in some degree the art
 of actual writing, that is of letters to absent friends, seems to narrow the meaning of 'writing' in such a way as to produce a somewhat ridiculous result. Surely any educated man, whether he be an orator and statesman or not, requires and possesses the knowledge of writing in that
 serve as a commentary ; Pericles, in his defence, describing his qualifi-





 $i v e \theta v \mu \eta \eta_{\eta}$.
 its various senses, see Grant ad Eth. Nic. 17.18, and the references in Introd. ad h. 1. p. 334, note 4), 'that of debate lends itself most to acting' (or delivery: is the 'most capable of being acted'). Comp. III 1.4. The reason of this as far as declamation is concerned, viz. why the graphic style admits of more ornament and artificial arrangement than the other, is thus stated by Cicero, Orat. IXI 208. After the invention of the period, \&c., he says, nemo qui aliquo esset in numero scripsit orationem generis eius, quod esset ad delectationem comparatum remotumque a iudiciis forensique certamine, quin redigeret omnes fere in quadrum numerumque sententias. Nam quum is est auditor, qui non vereatur ne compositae orationis insidiis sua fides attemptatur, gratiam quoque habet oratori voluptati aurium servienti.
'Of this (aंyoviotıкí) there are two kinds; one that (includes, conveys,) represents character, the other emotion (in the speech)'. That is, not that dंycutorıkí is a genus, containing two species under it, moral and emotional: for this is not the fact, and also any speech may have both: but that these two elements belong specially, not exclusively, to the two debating branches of Rhetoric, of which they are very prominent ingredients: the reality of the interests at stake giving more room for the play of passion and the assumption of character than the cold unimpassioned, deliberate written compositions. The ethical part is of two kinds,
 ages and conditions, II 12.17. The emotional is of course that which is partially described I 2.5, and treated at length in II 2.16. Of these
 tises were full, I 1.3, of which Thrasymachus' ${ }^{1} \lambda$ eot (III 1.7) described by Plato, Phaedr. 267 C , was a well-known specimen. Quint. III 8. 12, (In concionibus deliberatio) affectus, ut quae maxima, postulat, seq. Valet autem in consiliis auctoritas (this is principally due to $\bar{\eta} \theta o s$ ) plurimum, seq. See III 7. 1, 3, 6, where the two are described. The $\boldsymbol{j} \boldsymbol{\theta}$ os is there confined to those of age, nation, station, \&c. Compare with all this,





'And this is why actors also (as well as debaters) hunt after ( $\delta \stackrel{\omega}{ } \omega^{-}$ кovor) plays of this kind (that is, plays of which the subjects give scope for the exhibitions of passion and character), and the poets after persons (whether actors to represent the $\pi a \dot{a} \theta \eta$, or characters in the dramas to be represented with them) of the same kind. At the same time, the poets




that can be read (that write to be read as well as acted or rhapsodised) become pocket-companions, or favourites'.
ßactáserAat is said of anything that is carried about in the hand or arms, fondled, cherished, fondly and familiarly treated, like a baby or pet lapdog; and hence when applied to a book naturally means one that people are fond of, and carry about with them in their pockets. There are several instances in Sophocles-see Ellendt's Lex.-that illustrate this sense of $\beta a \sigma \tau a ́ \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$, as Philoct. 655 of the favourite bow and 657,

 press and caress) $\chi$ 'ípt (Blomfield's Glos. ad loc.). Quint. vili 3. I2, of any striking sentiment or expression, intuendum (to be narrowly looked into) et paene pertractandum.
' Chaeremon for instance who is as exact (highly finished) as a professional speech-writer (such as Isocrates), and Licymnius amongst the dithyrambic poets'. On Chaeremon, see note II 23. 29, ult. [The ixpißeıa of Chaeremon may be illustrated by his partiality for minute details, such as enumerating the flowers of a garland, e.g. Athenaeus xv p. 679 F,
 see 11 II. 7; Shilleto on Dem. de F. L. § 274 Licymnius is mentioned above, III 2. 13, where reference is made to Camb. Fourn. of Cl. and Sacred Phil. No. Ix. Vol. III pp. 255-7, for an account of what is known of him; and again III 13.5.
'And upon comparison the (speeches, $\lambda$ óyot) of the weriters when delivered in actual contests have a narrow, confined, contracted (i.e. poor, mean, paltry) appearance, whilst those of the orators (meaning particularly the public speakers, in the assembly), which by their skilful delivery succeed or pass muster' (none of this is expressed but 'well delivered'1), 'when taken in the hands (to read) look like the work of mere bunglers or novices'. orevis is the Latin tenuis, and the English slight and slender, in a contemptuous and depreciatory sense. In its primary sense of narrow it stands in opposition, in respect of style, to the wider range, and the broader, larger, freer, bolder, tone required by the loftier and more comprehensive subjects, and also by the larger audiences, of public speakers; the high finish and minute artifices of structure, as well as the subtler and finer shades of intonation and expression, are lost in a crowd and in the open air. So Whately, Rhet. ch. Iv (Encycl. Metrop. p. 301 a), describes the agonistic style, as "a style somewhat more blunt (than the graphic) and homely, more simple and, apparently, unstudied in its structure, and at the same time more daringly energetic." orevoi then

[^15]





represents the comparative narrozuness or confined character of the graphic style, with its studied artificial graces, careful composition, and other such 'paltrinesses', 'things mean and trifling'-a sense in which it occurs in a parallel passage of Pl. Gorg. 497 c , where $\sigma \mu$ uкpà kaì $\sigma \tau \in \nu$ á are contemptuously applied by Callicles to Socrates' dialectics. This is actually said of Isocrates, in the passage of Dionysius, de Isocr. Iud. c. 13, by Hieronymus, the philosopher of Rhodes ; àvayv $\omega$ vat $\mu \dot{\ell} \nu$ äl $\tau \iota \nu a$



i8cштькоi] such as have only the capacity (-kós) of unprofessional persons, or laymen in art, \&c. as opposed to clerks, when all science and Iearning were in the hands of the clergy. $i 8 \iota \omega \pi \eta s$ is opposed to $\delta \eta$ mıovpyós, a practitioner of any art, science, profession, or pursuit : and especially to philosophy and its professors, as in the adage, iotérys év

 $\theta$ évers. But I confess that I do not see who could be intended by rêv

 rival, Hortensius. Quintilian [ XI 3.8 , after telling us that Hortensius was, during his lifetime, first thought to be chief of all orators, secondly Cicero's rival, and thirdly second to him alone, adds, ut appareat placuisse aliquid eo dicente quod legentes non invenimus (the same may be said of many sermons). Isocrates' Phil. §§ 25, 26, an excellent commentary on this, is unfortunately too long to quote.
' The reason is that their appropriate place is in an actual contest or debate' (with ápuórreı supply, if you please, raûra as the nomin.-it means at all events the subject of the immediately preceding clause): 'and this also is why things (speeches) intended to be acted or delivered (lit. proper to be, or capable of being, -kós), when the delivery is withdrawn don't produce their own proper effect (or perform their special function, ढ̈pyov), and so appear silly: for instance asyndeta, and the reiteration of the same word in the written, graphic style'-with which the agonistic divested of its acting or delivery is now (surreptitiously) associated-' are rightly disapproved; whereas in debating the orators do employ them, because they are proper for acting '. Aquila c. 30 (ap. Gaisford, Not. Var.), Ideoque et Aristoteli et iteratio ipsa verborum ac nominum et repetitio frequentior, et omnis huius modi motus actioni magis et certamini quam stilo videtur convenire.








§ 3. What follows is a note, a passing observation suggested by the subject, but not immediately connected with it. 'In this repetition of the same thing, some change must be made in the mode of expression of each member of it': (the repetition should be made in different words, to avoid monotony. See on the interpretation of this, and the figure $\mu \in \tau a-$ $\beta_{0} \lambda_{\eta}$; to which $\mu_{\epsilon \tau \boldsymbol{T}} \beta_{\text {ád }} \lambda_{\epsilon \epsilon \nu}$ points, a full explanation, Introd. p. 326, and note I:) 'which paves the way as it were for the delivery' (on tpoodonotei, see note on I I. 2). "This is he that stole from you, this is he that cheated you, this is he that last of all attempted to betray you"'. (From an unknown rhetorician ; most probably not the author's own.) 'And again, as another instance, what Philemon the actor (not to be confounded with the Comic poet) used to do in Anaxandrides' Old men's madness, where (lit. when, ör $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ ) he says (uses the words in playing his part) "Rhadamanthys and Palamedes," and also, in the prologue of the Devotees, the word 'ं' $\omega^{\prime}$ : for if such things (phrases, sentences, or words) as these be not (varied) in the delivery, they become like "the man that carries the beam," in the proverb ( $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu)^{\prime}$ ', i.e. stiff and awkward, like one that has 'swallowed a poker', as our proverb has it.

Anaxandrides, quoted before, III 10.7. The first citation from his comedy, the $\gamma \in \rho o \nu \tau o \mu a v i a$, has the rest of the verse supplied in Athen. Xiv
 $\mu a \nu \theta u s$ каi $\Pi a \lambda a \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \eta \mathrm{~s}$. On the passage of Aristotle, which he quotes, Meineke, Fr. Comic. Gr. III 166, has the following remark: "Philemon autem quid fecerit in recitandis verbis P. кai II., non satis apparet." I don't suppose the repetition to have been confined to these words; all that Aristotle means to say seems to be, when Philemon had come to that point, thereabouts, the repetition took place. "Num forte eadem verba in pluribus deinceps versibus recitabantur et alio atque alio vocis flexu et sono ab histrione recitabantur? (This follows Victorius' interpretation of $\mu \epsilon \tau a ß a ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$.$) Ita sane videtur, neque alia alterius loci fuerit ratio, in quo$ identidem repetebatur pronomen '́ $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { c o }}$." At all events, these were two notorious and well-remembered points made by Philemon in this varied repetition in acting the character which he sustained in these two comedies. There is, or was, a similar tradition (which I heard from Dr Butler, the late Bp of Lichfield, and Master of Shrewsbury School) of the effect produced by Garrick's rendering of Pray you undo this button:-thank you, sir,-of Lear, choking in his agony, at the point of death [v. III. 309].









§ 4. 'And of asyndeta the same may be said, "I came, I met, I implored". I have translated this upon the supposition that there is no intention of distinguishing here the aorist and imperfect: 'for (here again) delivery (i. e. intonation) must come into play, and it must not be spoken as if it were all one, with the same character and accent'. Of div-






 § II, Rhet. Gr. 11 435, Spengel.

A good example of asyndeton, illustrating the rapidity and vivacity which it imparts to style, is supplied by Victorius from Demosth. c.



The vivacity imparted to style by asyndeton and the opposite (the employment of connecting particles) is admirably explained and illustroated by Campbell, Phil. of Rhet. Bk. III sect. 2, near the end (and ed. Vol. II pp. 287-293.)
'Further asyndeta have a certain special property; that (by their aid) many things seem to be said in the same time' (as one thing would be, if they had been employed); 'because the connecting particle (or connexion) converts several things into one, (Harris, Hermes, II 2, p. 240,) and therefore if it be withdrawn (extracted), plainly the contrary will take place; one will become many. Accordingly (the asyndeton) exaggrates (or amplifies: or multiplies, increases the number) ${ }^{1}$ : "I came, I conversed, I supplicated": (the hearer or reader) seems to overlook or survey a number of things that he (the speaker) said'. (I have followed

${ }^{1}$ The opposite of this, the employment of $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha$, , sometimes tends to produce the same effect. Demetr. $\pi$. $\dot{\rho} \rho \mu \eta \nu \in i a s, \& 54$, $\dot{\omega} s \pi a \rho^{\prime}{ }^{\circ} 0 \mu \eta \eta \rho($ II. в 497),
 did Tours $\sigma u v \delta i \epsilon \sigma \mu o u s ~ \kappa . ~ т . \lambda ., ~ a n d ~ a g a i n, ~ § ~ 63 . ~$


Nıрєùs òs ка́入入ıбтos.



 топ $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \mu \in \nu$ оя.

## 5 <br> 

 scure. Bekker, Ed. i, has $\pi$ о $\lambda \lambda a^{\circ}$ ©
'And this is Homer's intention also in writing Nireus at the commencement of three lines running'. Il. II 691. On this Demetrius, $\pi$. $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rho-$
 $\mu$ ккро́тєра-all this is raised to magnitude and importance by énavaфopá, repetition, and 8 oá $\lambda v \sigma t s$, asyndeton. He then quotes the three lines; and,



 by a certain disposition or arrangement) $\pi$ o $\lambda \lambda$ à фaiveral, oṽтш кả้ тoís $\lambda$ óyous. Comp. also Hermogenes, $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\iota}$ è $\pi a \nu a \lambda \eta \psi \epsilon ́ \omega s$, de repetitione, $\pi . \mu \epsilon \theta \dot{d} \delta o v$ סecvótŋros, § 9 (Rhet. Gr. II 433, Spengel), who gives this example of Nireus, with others from Homer, Xenophon, and Demosthenes. Illustrations of this emphatic repetition, and especially of that of the pronoun av̇óśs, occur in a fragm. of Aeschyl., Fragm. Inc. 266, quoted at length in Plat. Rep. II 383 B, the most forcible of them all : $\kappa$ ajy ${ }^{(T h e t i s) ~}$

 $\pi$ aî̀a $\boldsymbol{\text { rò }} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ €́ $\mu o ́ \nu . ~ A f t e r ~ t h i s ~ i t ~ w i l l ~ b e ~ u n n e c e s s a r y ~ t o ~ q u o t e ~ i n f e r i o r ~ s p e c i-~$ mens; such as Xen. Anab. III 2. 4, Aesch. Eumen. 765, with Paley's note, and Blomfield's note on 745, in Linwood's ed. p. 188, where several references are given.
' For a person (or thing) of which many things are said must necessarily be often mentioned; and therefore (this is a fallacy) they think it follows (kai, that it is also true) that if the name is often repeated, there must be a great deal to say about its owner: so that by this fallacy (the poet) magnifies (Nireus) by mentioning him only once (i.e. in one place), and makes him famous though he nowhere afterwards speaks of him again'. This is the fallacy of illicit conversion of antecedent and conse-

 the fallacy exposed in III 7.4.
§ 5. It seems as if in the following section Aristotle had, probably unconsciously misled by the ambiguous term, used ákpıßís and its $\pi \tau \dot{\omega}-$

##  

$\sigma \in t s$ in two distinct senses: exactness and high finish in style and reasoining. The general subject and connexion of the chapter will oblige us to refer the first clause, with its comparison of public speaking to a rough sketch in black and white, without details, and producing no effect on close inspection, to the style of the speech-which indeed is the subject of the whole book as well as this chapter-though it may possibly include also minute details of reasoning. The same thing may be said of $\dot{\eta} \delta i \kappa \eta \dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho \iota \beta \epsilon \in \tau \tau \rho \rho \nu:$ in this the style and the argument may be minuter, exacter and more detailed in proportion to the diminished size of the audience, and the increased probability of their paying attention to such things (see note ad loc.). But when we come to the third degree, the single judge, it seems to be false and absurd to say that exactness and high finish of style is more suited to speeches addressed to him: no man would endeavour to attract or impose upon an arbitrator by such artifices. The exactness in this case seems therefore to be confined to exactness of reasoning and minute detail, as of evidence and the like. A single judge-as in our own courts-would always be more patient, more inclined to listen to, and more influenced by, exact reasoning and circumstantial evidence than either of the two preceding : the mob of the assembly would not hear them, nor follow them, nor listen to them at all : the large body of dicasts would be more ready to do so: but most of all the single judge. The last clause of the section brings us back to the point from which it started, viz. differences of style, and seems to apply this exclusively to what has been said of ákpißeıa in forensic pleading.
' Now the style of public-speaking is exactly like scene-painting; for the greater the crowd, the more distant the point of view, and consequently' (in these crowded assemblies; held too in the open air-which should be added in respect of the style required, though this does not distinguish it from forensic rhetoric,) 'all exactness, minute and delicate touches, and high finish in general appear to be superfluous and for the worse (deviating from the true standard of public speaking) in both'. Compare with this Whately's remarks, partly borrowed from Ar., Rhet. c. Iv (Encycl. Metrop. p. 299), on the "bolder, as well as less accurate, kind of language allowable and advisable in speaking to a considerable number': he quotes Ar.'s comparison of scene-painting, and then proceeds "to account for these phenomena"-which Ar. has omitted to do. His explanation is derived from the various sympathies which are especially awakened in a great crowd.

бкıaypaфia is a painting in outline and chiaroscuro, or light and shade, without colour, and intended to produce its effect only at a dis-tance-herein lies the analogy to public speaking-consequently rough and unfinished, because from the distance all niceties and refinements in style and finish would be entirely thrown away ( $\pi \epsilon \rho i \epsilon \rho \gamma a)$. This point is well brought out in a parallel passage of Plat. Theaet. $208 \mathrm{E}, \nu \hat{\nu} \nu \delta \hat{\eta} \tau a, \omega^{\circ}$








(Heindorf, note ad loc.): "as long as he was at a distance he seemed to understand the meaning of what was said; on a nearer approach all the apparent clearness vanished, and it became confused and indistinct." In Phaedo, 69 в, $\sigma \kappa \iota a \gamma \rho a \phi i a$ is a mere rough sketch or outline; a daub, without any distinct features (see Wyttenbach ad loc.). Parmen. 165 C , oiov

 the Phaedo. Ast ad loc. Comm. p. 410 . And in several other passages of Plato. As the point of comparison here is solely the difference between the near and distant effects, I have translated it 'scene-painting' (as also Whately) which represents this better to us: the proper and literal meaning of the word is "the outline of a shadow", the supposed origin of painting. See further in Mr Wornum's art. on 'painting', in
 where the 'appearance' as opposed to the 'reality', is compared to this
 $\rho \omega \theta \in \nu \quad \theta \in \omega \rho o \hat{\sigma} \sigma \iota \nu$.
 more exactness and finish'. The audience is less numerous, and nearer, literally and metaphorically, to the speaker; they are nearer to him locally, so they can hear better what he says, and also nearer to him in respect of the knowledge of persons and circumstances, which permits him to enter into more minute detail. Also they are not personally interested in the dispute, and can afford to bestow more attention upon minutiae of style, action, intonation, and such like, and being comparatively unoccupied are more likely to notice and criticize such things. All these are
 seq. After speaking of the declamatory style, he continues, Alia veris consiliis ratio est; ideoque Theophrastus quam maxime remotum ab omni affectatione in deliberativo genere voluit esse sermonem: secutus in hoc auctoritatem praeceptoris sui; quanquam dissentire ab eo non timide solet. Namque Aristoteles idoneam maxime ad scribendum demonstrativam, proximanque ab ea iudicialem putavit et seq.
' And still further (in respect of the reduction of the number of hearers, and the consequent admissibility of accuracy and finish in the speech) that (subaudi 8iкп, the pleading) before a single judge: for he is least of all subject to (liable to be imposed on by) rhetorical artifices (appeals to the feelings and the like): for he takes a more comprehensive view of what belongs to the subject and what is foreign to it (this seems to define the kind of $\dot{a} \times \rho i \beta_{e t a}$ that is here intended) and the contest is absent (there is no room for partisanship and prejudice) and his judgment clear or pure (i.e. free and unbiassed; sincerum, pure of all alloy, such as the preceding). And this is why the







same orators don't succeed (become popular, distinguish themselves) in all these (at once): but where action or delivery is most required, there is least of exact finish to be found'. [With ó à⿰àv äneotıv comp. Cic. ad Att. I 16.8 remoto illo studio contentionis quem áyôva vos appellatis.]

With $\mu$ á̀ıбтa $\mathbf{~ i ́ \pi о к р i \sigma e \omega s ~ s o m e t h i n g ~ m u s t ~ b e ~ s u p p l i e d : ~ w h e t h e r ~ w e ~}$ should understand $8 \in i ̂$ or the like; or simply '́cti', 'when it (the speech, or the thing in general,) belongs to, is concerned with, when it is a question of, delivery'. 'And this where voice is required, and especially loud voice' (to reach a larger assembly).

фшví, voice in general, means the various qualities of voice, flexibility, sweetness, power, \&c.; out of which a powerful voice is especially distinguished as the most important. It seems that Aeschines was very proud of his sonorous voice. Demosth. alludes to this, de F. L. § 388 ,



§6. 'So now, as I was saying, the demonstrative, declamatory, branch of Rhetoric is the best adapted for writing; for its special function (the purpose which it was made to serve, its $\tilde{\epsilon}^{(p y o \nu}{ }^{1}$ ) is reading: and in the second degree the dicastic branch' (and its pleadings). Comp. supra III I. 4 and 7. Cic. Orat. LXI 208 (already referred to). Quint. u. s. (III 8.63) referring to this place, Namque Ar. iduneam maxime ad scribendum demonstrativam, proximamque ab ea iudicialem putavit: videlicet quoniam prior illa tota esset ostentationis; haec secunda egeret artis, vel ad fallendum, si ita poposcisset utilitas; consilia fide prudentiaque constarent. It is very manifest, and had already been pointed out by Victorius and Spalding, ad loc. Arist. et Quint., that this is not Aristotle's meaning.
'To make the further distinction, that the language must be sweet and magnificent is superfluous'-the author of this 'distinction' is Theodectes, in his 'Art.' Quint. Iv 2.63, Theodectes...non magnificam modo vult esse, verum etiam iucundam expositionem -'for why that more

[^16] $\lambda о \pi \rho \epsilon \pi \hat{\eta}, \pi \epsilon \rho i \epsilon \rho \gamma \circ \nu \cdot \tau i ́ \gamma \alpha \dot{\rho} \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu \hat{\eta} \sigma \omega \dot{\omega} \phi \rho о \nu \alpha \kappa \alpha i$










than continent (or perhaps discreet) and liberal, or any other virtue of character (the moral virtues, of which $\mu \in \gamma a \lambda o \pi \rho \dot{\pi} \pi \epsilon \boldsymbol{a}$ is one. Eth. Nic. II and iv)?' For $\pi \rho o \sigma 8$ dalpeíalat, Brandis' Anonymus, quoted in Schneidewin's Philologus [Iv. i.] p. 45, has пробд̀ıó'̧ eclat.
'For plainly the sweetness will be produced by all that has been enumerated (purity, propriety, rhythm, vivacity, and the rest) if we have rightly defined what the excellence of the language consists in: for why (else, subaudi ar $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ot) must it be (as we have described it) clear, and not low (mean and common-place), but appropriate (ch.
 it be verbose, it is not clear ; nor if it be too concise (brief)'. Bewis esse laboro, obscurus foo. àdo入eбхciv, said of idle chatter: here of verbosity, vain repetition, tautology. Comp. de Soph. El. c. 3, 165615 ,

 ágaфès 8ià rì̀ ádodecxiav, and II 21.3, where it is applied to unnecessary accumulation of steps of proof in reasoning, or drawing inferences.
' But (on the contrary) it is quite plain (of itself, and without rule or precept) that the mean is the appropriate style'. Of this the preceding example is an illustration : clearness or perspicuity is the mean between the excess of garrulity, verbosity, and the defect overconciseness, in the amount of words. 'Also the rules (ingredients) already stated will produce sweetness of language if they be well mixed, viz. the familiar (these are the óvó $\mu a \tau a$ кúpıa, the customary), and the foreign ( $\gamma \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \tau a t, \dot{\epsilon} \xi \eta \lambda \lambda a \gamma-$
 and the rhythm, and the plausibility that arises out of (the due observaton of) propriety' (supra c. 7).
' We have now finished our remarks upon style or language, of all (the three branches of Rhetoric) in common (cc. 2-II), and of each kind individually (c. 12): it now remains to speak of the order (division and arrangement) of the parts of the speech'.




CHAP. XIII.

Of the two divisions of this third book, proposed at the conclusion of
 тà $\mu \dot{\mu} \rho \eta$ тov̀ $\lambda \dot{o}$ 'ov, the first having been dispatched in the preceding chapters 2-12, we now proceed to the second, on the arrangement of the parts of the speech : this will include a criticism of the anterior, and the current, divisions, with a new classification in c. 13: and an explanation and discussion of the proper contents of each. A full account of the various divisions which prevailed before and after Aristotle has been already given in the Introd. p. 331, 332, and the notes, and need not be here repeated. It will be sufficient to say that Aristotle in this chapter takes the fourfold division, adopted by Isocrates, and accepted by his followers, as the author of the Rhet. ad Alex., viz. apooíciov, $\delta_{i \eta \gamma \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \iota s, \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota s, \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \lambda o y o s_{2}}$ criticizes it, and reduces it to two, $\bar{\pi} \rho o \dot{\theta} \theta \in \sigma \iota s$ and nioreis, as the only two parts necessary to the speech; adding notices of some superfluous distinctions introduced by Theodorus (of Byzantium) and Licymnius. [See Rössler's pamphlet, Rhetorum antiquorum de dispositione doctrina, pp. 30, Budissin, 1866 ; and Volkmann, die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer, § 38.]

On the importance attached to the arrangement of the topics of these divisions, and especially to the order of the proofs, Whately has some good remarks, Rhet. c. I (Encycl. Metrop. p. 256). This is illustrated by the contest between Demosthenes and Aeschines. "Aeschines strongly urged the judges (in the celebrated contest for the Crown) to confine his adversary to the same order in his reply to the charges brought which he himself had observed in bringing them forward. Demosthenes however was far too skilful to be thus entrapped; and so much importance does he attach to the point, that he opens his speech with a most solemn appeal to the judges for an impartial hearing; which implies, he says, not only a rejection of prejudice, but no less also a permission for each speaker to adopt whatever arrangement he should think fit. And accordingly he proceeds to adopt one very different from that which his antagonist had laid down; for he was no less sensible than his rival that the same arrangement which is the most favourable It one side, is likely to be least favourable to the other."
§ 1. 'Of the speech there are (only) two parts: for it is only necessary first to state the subject, and then to prove (your side of) it. It follows from this necessary relation between them ( $\delta \circ 0^{\prime}$ ), that it is impossible (if the speech is to be complete) either to state your case without going on to prove it, or to prove it without having first stated it', (the impossibility lies in the absurdity of the supposition: it is a moral





ar in es. i. ... impossibility): 'for proving implies something to prove, and a preliminary statement is made in order to be proved'. All this implies that the speaker has some object in view, some case to make out. It would not apply to all declamations; though it is true that, as a general rule, even they try to prove something, however absurd it may be.
§ 2. 'Of these the one is the statement of the case (the setting forth of all its circumstances, as a foundation for judgment and argument), the other the (rhetorical) arguments in support of it, just as if the division were (the dialectical one) the problem (alternative question proposed or stated) and its demonstration'. $\pi \rho \dot{\theta} \theta$ ecus, propositio: Rhet.


 quod in disputando quaestione bipartita efferri solebat, ex. gr. voluptas estne expetenda, annon? mundus este aeternus, annon ?" Trendelenburg, $E l . \log . A r . ~ § 42$, p. 118.
§3. 'The present' '(current, Isocrates') 'division is absurd ; for surely narrative (orivncis narration, the detailed description of the circumstances of the case) belongs only to the forensic speech, but in a demonstrative or public speech how can there be a narrative such as they describe, or a reply to the opponent; or an epilogue (peroration) in argumentative or demonstrative speeches?' On this Quint. says, III 9 . 5, Ramen nee its assentor quid detrahunt refutationem (sc. тà mos rò̀ di diriö̀rov) tanquam probation subiectam, ut Aristoteles; haec enim est quae constituat, ill quae destruat. Hoc quoque idem aliquatenus novat, quod prooemio non narrationem subiungit, sed propositionem. (This is one of Quintilian's ordinary misrepresentations of writers whom he quotes. Ar. says nothing here of the prooemium, theoretically disallowing it: though in compliance with the received custom he afterwards gives an account of it and its contents. Serum id fact quid proposition genus, narratio species videtur: et hat non semper, ill semper et ubique credit opus esse. The last clause very well explains Ar.'s substitution of $\pi \rho \dot{\rho} \theta e \sigma t s$ for ( $\pi \rho o o i \mu \iota o \nu$ and) dingy $^{2} \sigma$ cs.

In Introd. p. 333, I have given at length from Tic. de Inv. I 19. 27, the distinction of $\delta \iota \eta \gamma \eta \sigma t s$ in its ordinary sense and $\pi \rho o \dot{\theta} \theta \in \sigma t s$. It is here said that the narrative or statement of the case, strictly speaking, belongs (he means necessarily belongs) only to the forensic branch of Rhetoric: there there is always a case to state: in the declamatory, panegyrical branch, not a regular systematic narrative or detailed statement as of a case ; in this the $\delta$ or $\gamma \eta \sigma \iota s$ is dispersed over the whole speech, infra 16.1 : and, in $\delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma o p i a$ equally, there is not universally or necessarily, as in the law-speech, a $\delta$ tin $\eta \eta \sigma t s$, because




its time is the future，and a narrative of things future is impossible： when it is used，it is to recall the memory of past facts for the purpose of comparison－which is a very different thing from the forensic divinots． Comp．c．16．II．The author of the Rhet．ad Alex．c． 30 （31）includes
 Isocrates．On $\delta$ tívnots see Dionysius Hal．，Ass Rhet．c．x § 14.

The same argument applies to the refutation，rà $\approx p \dot{\rho} s ~ \tau \grave{̀} \nu$ àvrì̀ıov，and with more force than to the preceding，for in the epideictic branch there is no adversary，and therefore can be no refutation of his arguments， at least such as those who lay down this division intend：though it is true that a panegyrist may have to meet adverse statements or impu－ tations on the object of his panegyric，real or supposed．In fact，it is only in the forensic branch that there is necessarily an opponent．On this division，see III 17．14， 15.
 and Schrader of the demonstrativum genus， $\boldsymbol{a} \pi \mathbf{o \delta}$ ．being supposed to be put here for $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \delta \epsilon k \pi \tau \kappa \omega \omega$ ．This in Aristotle I hold to be impossible．Nor have I found any example of it elsewhere，though Victorius says that
 speech．I have supposed（in note on p． 335 Introd．）that his text of Isocrates may have exhibited this interchange from the uncorrected carelessness of transcribers．What is true is，that Isocrates，twice in the Panes．§§ 18 and 65 ，does use ėmideurvivat in a sense nearly ap－ proaching，if not absolutely identical with，that of a a oòekxuvava．The words can only mean，as I have translated them，that there may be some speeches which consist entirely of proof or arguments，and that a summary of these would not correspond to the $\boldsymbol{\pi} \pi \boldsymbol{i}$ oo os in its ordinary sense－described c．19．I－of which only a small part is a recapitulation．
＇And again $\pi$ pooimov（preface，opening or introduction），and com－ parson（setting over against one another side by side）of opposing （views，statements，arguments），and review，are found in public speeches then only when there is a dispute（between two opponents）＇：as in Demosthenes＇Speech for the Crown，of which the $\pi \rho o o i \mu t o \nu$ has been before referred to．i̇mávodos，＇a going over again＇＝àvaкє申а入аi $\omega$ gus，summary recapitulation of the foregoing topics of the speech，appears also in Plato


 （2I）．I）．It is properly a subdivision of the $\dot{\pi} \pi$ inoyos，and as such is here condemned as superfluous．
örav avtidoyia $\left.{ }_{\eta}\right]$＂The object of the prooemium is to conciliate the audience，and invite their attention，and briefly intimate the subject of the ensuing speech．In recommending this or that measure to the assembly，unless there is an adversary who has poisoned the hearers＇







minds against it and its author, or some other special reason, there is no occasion for this: and also, the audience is usually well acquainted with the subject. See further on this, c. I4. II. Comparison of argument, and review, can only be required when there is an opposition." Untrod. pp. 335, 6. The Rhet. ad Alex. expressly tells us, c. 28 (29) ult., that the $\pi \rho o o i \mu t o \nu$ is "common to all the seven species, and will be appropriate to every kind of (rhetorical) business."

 essential parts of the public speech-'Why at that rate (is the reply) so are accusation and defence, for they are frequently there'-this involves the absurdity of introducing the whole contents of the forensic genus into the $\delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma o \rho \iota \kappa \grave{\nu} \nu$ y'vos as a mere part of the latter- 'but not qua deliberation': not in the sense or character of deliberation, which is essential to the deliberative branch, but as mere accidents.

There can be no question that we should read in for $\dot{\eta} \sigma \nu \mu \beta o v \lambda \eta$. So Victorius, Schrader, Buhle, Spengel. Beaker alone retains $\eta$. The following clause requires an alteration of punctuation to make it intellegible ; suggested long ago by Victorius, Majoragius, Vater, and adopted by Spengel ; not so by Beaker. Spengel also rejects ert [delendum tut in
 8ıкavikov̂ к.т. ${ }^{\text {. it }}$ is certainly out of place. I am by no means persuaded of the certainty of this alteration-perhaps Beaker had the same reason for withholding his consent to the two alterations-I think it quite as likely that a word or two has drop out after énidoyos.
' But further' (if ext be retained) 'neither does the peroration belong to every forensic speech; as for instance if it be short, or the matter of it easy to recollect ; for what happens (in an ordinary epilogue) is a subtraction from the length'-not the brevity, of a speech : in. an epilogue is appropriate to a long speech, not a short one. This is Victorius' explanation, and no doubt right (that which I gave in the Untrod. is wrong, and also not Victorius', as stated in the note).
'Consequently the (only) necessary parts are the statement of the case, and the proof'.
§ 4. 'Now these two are peculiar to, and characteristic of, speeches in general'.

It is possible that $\boldsymbol{i}$ oo v here may be the proprium of logic, one of the predicables : that which characterizes a thing, without being absolutely






essential to it, as the genus and differentia are. The proprium is a necessary accident or property, though it is not of the essence itself: "but flowing from, or a consequence of, the essence, is inseparably attached to the species" (J. S. Mill, Logic, I p. 148). All this would apply very well to these two parts. They are not of the essence of the speech, and do not enter into the definition : the speech could exist without them. At the same time they are immediate consequences of that essence, and inseparably attached to all species of speeches, according to the view put forward here.

We might therefore be satisfied with these. 'If we add more' (following the authorities on the subject), 'they must be at the most, preface, statement of case, confirmatory arguments, conclusion : for the refutation of the adversary belongs to the proofs' (Quint. u.s. III 9.5, Tamen nec ios assentior qui detrahunt refutationem, tanquam probationi subiectam, ut Aristoteles; haec enim est quae constituat, illa quae destruat), 'and counter-comparison, (a comparative statement of your own views and arguments placed in juxtaposition with them to bring them into contrast,) which, being as it is a magnifying (making the most) of one's own case, must be a part of the confirmatory arguments, or general proof: for one who does this proves something: but not so the prologue; nor the epilogue, which merely recalls to mind'.
§ 5. 'Such divisions, if any one choose to make them, will be pretty much the same as the inventions of Theodorus and his school, that is, to distinguish narration from after-narration and fore-narration, and refutation and per-re-refutation'. In this compound word e $\pi i$ ' in addition' is represented by re, and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \xi$, 'out and out', 'outright', 'thoroughly', 'completely' by per. ota and per in composition are the more usual and direct exponents of 'thoroughness' or 'complete carrying through', of a thing.
 magis quam forensis. He accepts it as a division, but thinks it should be rarely used. Plato, Phaedr. 266 D seq., in speaking of these same superfluous divisions of Theodorus, leaves out $\dot{\epsilon} \pi t$ - and $\pi \rho o-\delta i i^{\eta} \eta \eta \sigma t s$, and introduces $\pi i \sigma \tau \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ кai $\grave{\epsilon \pi} \pi \pi i \sigma \tau \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ in their place. These plainly correspond to the other pair $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \gamma \gamma 0$ and $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \in \xi \in \lambda e \gamma \chi o s$, the one being confirmatory, the other refutatory arguments. See Camb. Fourn. of Cl . and Sacred Phil. No. Ix. Vol. III p. 285, and Thompson's notes on the Phaedrus.

The general drift of the last clause is this; if you introduce such divisions at all, you may go on dividing and subdividing for ever, as Theodorus does in his $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ éx $\quad \eta$. This is followed by the statement of the true


 on $\pi \epsilon \rho \frac{\text { ex }}{} \nu$ char. xiv. p. 136.
principle of division : the foundation of my own twofold division, hints Ar. 'But a name (like one of these, the class-name, or, as here, the name of a division) should be given to mark a kind and a specific difference'. It is the genus plus the specific (eiסonotós, species-making) difference that constitutes the distinct species or kind. Now these names, though supposed to mark distinct kinds, have no specific differences which thus distinguish them. A special name demands a real distinction of kinds. Waitz ad Categ. I $b 17$. Trendelenburg, El. Log. Ar. § 59.
' Otherwise they become empty and frivolous, such as Licymnius' inventons in his art, the names which he coins, è $\pi v u^{\prime} \rho \omega \sigma t s, ~ a ̀ \pi o \pi \lambda a ́ \nu \eta \sigma t s$ and on tot'. On Licymnius and his productions, see Heindorf ad Phaedr. u. s. p. 242, and Camb. Fourn. of Cl. and Sacred Phil. No. Ix. Vol. III pp. 255-7; where an attempt is made to explain these three obscure names. Licymnius was a dithyrambic poet, supra III 12.2, as well as a rhetorician, and his prose style seems to have participated in the dithyrambic character. einovi$\rho \omega \sigma \iota s$ I take to be a word coined by Licymnius for his own purposes: it
 ímovpi乡cıv, 'to speed onward by a fair gale', also $\sigma v \nu \epsilon \pi o v p i \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$, Hist. Anim. viII 13.9, de Caelo, III 2. 17: Polybius has émovpoû̀ II 10.6, and karovpoûv, 144.3, 61.7, both as neut. The Schol. quoted by Spengel, Artium Scrip-

 seems to favour the notion that the figurative rhetorician represented 'subsidiary' or 'confirmatory arguments', Theodorus' mioroots and èmt$\pi i \sigma \tau \omega \sigma t s$, under the image of 'a fair wind astern'. $\dot{a} \pi o \pi \lambda{ }^{2}{ }^{2} \eta \sigma \iota s$ is no doubt, as in Plato Polit. 263 C, 'a digression', wandering off from the
 likely means places in which the discourse 'branches off' in different directions, 'ramifications': unless the same Scholiast's explanation be
 the 'branches' opposed to the stock or trunk, as something extraneous, or at all events nonessential. (I think this is preferable.)

CHAP. XIV.
Having considered the divisions of the speech in general we now come to the details, to the enumeration and examination of the ordinary contents of each of the four. These in each case are discussed under the heads of the three branches of Rhetoric. The treatment of the $\pi \rho o o i \mu$ ion occupies the 14th chapter, to which is appended a second, $\mathbf{c} . \mathbf{x v}$, which analyses the topics of $\delta a \alpha \beta_{0} \lambda \eta$ ', the art of 'setting a man against his neighbour', infusing suspicion and hostile feeling against him in the minds of others, raising a prejudice against him-especially of course in the minds of judges against your opponent. One would be sorry to be





obliged to call this 'calumniating'. $\Delta \iota \eta \gamma \eta \sigma \iota s$ is treated in $\mathrm{c} . \mathrm{xvi}, \pi i \sigma \pi \epsilon t s$ in xvii : to which is attached in xviii a digression on $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \rho \omega^{\prime} \tau \eta \sigma \iota s$, the mode of putting questions-this includes the 'answer', repartee: and the 19th chapter, appropriately enough, concludes the work with the conclusion (é $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ ìiooos, peroration) of the speech.

The prooemium is thus defined by the author of the Rhet. ad Alex.


 avirois roiñal. These rules seem to be chiefly derived from the actual practice of the Orators. Some of the arts to which public speakers had recourse in the topics of their prooemium are mentioned by Isocrates, Paneg. § I3. Compare Cic. de Orat. II 19.80; de Invent.I 15.20 ; where it is defined: it has two parts, principium (the object of this is to make the hearer benevolum aut docilem aut attentum,) and insinuatio, oratio quadam dissimulatione et circuitione obscura subiens auditoris animum. Quint.Iv. c. I, seq. principium exordium. He agrees with the preceding; see § 5 . On the $\pi \rho o o i \mu c o \nu$ as a hymn, see Stallbaum ad Phaed. 60 D. On the prooemium in Rhetoric, Cic. de Orat. II 78, 79, principia dicendi. [See also Volkmann, die Rhetorik der Griechen ü. Römer § 12, die Einleitung.]
§ I. 'Now the prooemium is the beginning of a speech and stands in the place of the prologue in poetry (i.e. tragedy, and specially of Euripides' tragedy), and of the prelude in flute music'.
$\pi \rho o a v i d i o \nu]$ an introduction, ornamental, and preparatory to, not an essential part of, the theme or subject of the composition; for all these are beginnings, and as it were a paving of the way (preparation, pioneering of the road) for what follows (ódonoinoıs, note on I 1.2).
' Now the flute-prelude is like the prooemium of the epideictic branch: that is to say, as the flute-players first open their performance with whatever they can play best (in order to gain attention and favour of the audience) which they then join on to the iv $\delta$ órcuov (the actual opening, preliminary notes, of the subject which gives the tone, or cue, to the rest), so in the epideictic speeches the writing (of the $\pi \rho o o i-$ $\mu \iota o v)$ ought to be of this kind: for (in these the speaker) may say first (einóva) anything he pleases, and then should at once sound the note of preparation, and join on (the rest)'.

This represents the epideictic prooemium, like the flute-prelude, as hardly at all connected with what follows; it is a preliminary flourish, anything that he knows to be likely to be most successful, as already observed, to conciliate the audience and put them in good humour. "For here, as there is no real interest at stake, the author is allowed a much greater liberty in his choice of topics for amusing (and gaining



 over) an audience; a license which would be intolerable in a case of life and death, or in the suggestion of a course of action which may involve the safety or ruin of the state. Here the audience are too eager to come to the point to admit of any trifling with their anxiety." Introd. pp. 337, 8. Cic. de Or. II 80. 325, Connexum autem ita sit principium consequenti orationi, ut non tanquam citharoedi prooemium affictum aliquod, sed cohaerens cum omni corpore membrum esse videatur (Victorius). Quint. II 8.8, in demonstrativis (Arist.) prooemia esse maxime libera existimat.

The èvঠóorıцоу (subaudi $\mathfrak{a} \sigma \mu a$ or $\kappa \rho o \hat{\sigma} \sigma \mu a$, Bos, Ellips. s. v.) occurs; again Pol. $v$ (viII) 5 init. apparently in the same sense as here, 'intro-' duction'; also Pseudo-Arist. de Mundo, c. 6 § 20, where we have karà :
 кıעєital $\mu$ è̀ $\tau \dot{a}$ ä ä $\sigma \rho a$ к.r. $\lambda$. ' for according to the law above, by him who might be rightly called leader of the chorus, the stars are set in motion, \&ce' I have given this in full because it throws some light upon the meaning of $\dot{e} \nu \delta \dot{o} \sigma \mu \mu \nu \nu$, and explains its metaphorical application, God is here represented as the leader of a chorus who gives the time, the key-1 note, and the mode or tune, to the rest, and thus acts as a guide to be followed, or (in a similar sense) as an introduction, or preparatory transition to something else. It thus has the effect of the 'key-note', and takes the secondary sense of a 'guide', 'preparation for', 'introduction to', anything. So Plut. de disc. adul. ab amico, c. $55,73 \mathrm{~B}$, $\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon$

 évóóruov $\epsilon$ is $\pi a \rho \rho \dot{\rho} \eta \sigma i a \nu \dot{e} \sigma \tau t \nu$, 'gives the tone, the cue, i. e. the occasion or incitement, to freedom (taking liberties).' See other passages from Plutarch and others in Wyttenbach's note on 73 B. Gaisford and Wyttenbach refer to Gataker ad Anton. XI 20, p. 336 (G), XI 26 (w), "évס. usurpatur pro modulationis exordio, quo praecentor sive chori prae-

 "signum et adhortatio in certaminibus et musicis et gymnicis: tum ad alias res translatum." Lastly Athen. XIII 2, 556 A, of certain authors, ois
 the tone, i.e. hint', furnished the occasion for their statement. Schweighäuser, ad loc. says, "Dalecampius vertit quos ad id scribendum provocavit Ar. Dicitur autem proprie praecentus praeludium, exordium melodiae quod praeit chorodidascalus cui dein accinere oportet chorum. H. Stephanus' Thesaurus. Budaeus in Comm. Gr. Ling. p. 874 sq. 'ivoí-
 as it is here by Aristotle.
'And this is done by all. An example is the prooemium of Isocrates' Helen : for there is nothing in common between the disputatious dia-







lecticians, and Helen'. The prooemium, which occupies the first thirteen sections of the speech, includes many other subjects besides the 'िıotıкoí, and is certainly an excellent illustration of the want of connexion between proem and the rest in an epideictic speech. Quint. III 8.8, In demonstrativis vero prooemia esse maxime libera existimat (Ar.). Nam et longe a materia duci hoc, ut in Helenae laude Isocrates fecerit; et ex aliqua rei vicinia, ut idem in Panegyrico, cum queritur plus honoris corporum quam animorum virtutibus dari.
'And at the same time also (it has this further recommendation) that if (the speaker thus) migrate into a foreign region, there is this propriety in it, that the entire speech is not of the same kind' (it removes the wearisome monotony which is characteristic of this branch of Rhetoric).
ekroni乡ctv is to 'change one's residence', and applied especially to migratory birds and animals. It is always neuter in Aristotle. Hist. Anim. VIII 12. 3 and 8, IX 10. I, IV 8. 23, éktoтıбرov̀s motov̂vtal, vili 13. 14,
 proper or ordinary place, Pol. viII (v) 11, 1314 b 9, toîs éktori乌ovat tupávעots àmò tīs oikeias, and so ë́ктотos, éktóntos, ätomos 'out of their proper place'.
§ 2. 'The introductions in the epideictic branch are derived from praise and blame (naturally: see $13 \$ 3,4$ ); as, for instance, Gorgias' opening of his Olympic oration (a mavךүvpikòs $\lambda_{o ́ \gamma o s, ~ d e l i v e r e d ~ a t ~ t h e ~}^{\text {a }}$ Olympic games), "By many' (or vin' $\rho$, 'for many things'; which seems more in accordance with what followed) 'are ye worthy to be admired, 0 men of Hellas": that is to say ( $\gamma \dot{\rho} \rho$ videlicet) he praises those who first brought together the general assemblies'. Comp. Quint. III 8. 9, (continuation of the preceding quotation) et Gorgias in Olympico laudans eos qui primi tales instituerunt conventus (translated from Ar.). Another short fragment of this oration is preserved by Philostr. Vit. Soph. I 9.



 fragments, genuine and spurious, are collected by Sauppe Or. Att. III 129, seq. [See also Appendix to Thompson's ed. of the Gorgias.] Hieronymus adv. Iovin. (quoted by Wyttenbach on Plut. 144 B ), "Gorgias rhetor librum pulcerrimum de concordia, Graecis tunc inter se dissidentibus, recitavit Olympiae." Isocr., Panegyr. § 3, after stating the nature of the contents of his own speech, adds, in allusion to this,







 тои̂тоע тò̀ 入óyò ఱ̈ $\rho \mu \eta \sigma a \nu$ ．
＇But Isocrates blames them for that bodily excellences they rewarded with gifts，whilst to intellectual excellence they awarded no prize＇．This is the substance of the two first sections of Isocr．Paneg．Mr Sands， in his note ad locum，gives a summary of the whole exordium $\S \$ 1-14$ ． Victorius points out this as one of the places in which Aristotle＇s hostility to Isocrates appears！The problem here proposed by Isocr．－the oms－ sion of the institution of prizes for intellectual competition－is solved by Artist．，Probl．Xxx 1 I．
§ 3．＇（A second topic for an epideictic prooemium）is derived from advice（the deliberative branch）；for instance＂men are bound to pay honour to the good＂，and therefore he，the speaker，himself is going to praise Aristides＇（avirós is obliqua oratio：the directa oratio would have been $\epsilon^{\prime} \gamma \omega^{\prime}$ ：it is a sort of semi－quotation：where it comes from no one seems to know）；＇or，to all such as though not distinguished are yet not bad，only their merits are buried in obscurity，as Alexander （Paris），Priam＇s son．For one who speaks thus offers advice＇．The encomium Alexandri here referred is doubtless the same as that which has been already mentioned in II 23．5，8， 12 and II 27．7，9；the author is unknown．
§ 4．＇Further（a third kind）they may be borrowed from the forensic introductions；that is to say，from the appeals to the audience，or as an apology to them，（comp．infra § 7）－when the subject of the speech happens to be either paradoxical（contrary to ordinary opinion or ex－ pectation，and therefore incredible），or painful ${ }^{1}$ ，or trite and worn－out， and therefore tiresome（ $\tau \in \theta \rho v \lambda \eta \mu \notin \dot{\nu} \nu v$ that which is in everyone＇s mouth， decantatum，note on II 21．11）－for the purpose of obtaining indulgence （with an apologetic object）；as Choerilus says，for instance，＂But now
${ }^{1} \chi a \lambda \epsilon \pi 00, V i c t o r i u s, M a j o r a g i u s, ~ a r d u a ; ~ V e t . ~ T r a n s l . ~ e t ~ R i c c o b o n ~ d i f f i c i l i s . ~$ Is it＇hard to $d \theta$＇or＇hard to bear＇？$\chi a \lambda \epsilon \pi \delta$ s has both senses．If the former， it may mean，either，difficult，to the speaker to handle，or to the hearer to understand，or the recommendation of some scheme，undertaking，or policy， difficult to encounter or execute，（but this belongs to the deliberative rather than the epideictic branch）；if the latter－which seems equally probable－it is simply painful，unpleasant．So Find．Fragm． 96 （Böckh，Fragm．P．II p．621）v．9，
 hard season＇．Legs．［744 D］$\chi$ a入erì nevil．Et passim ap．Home．et et． So in Latin durus．
àкроати́v, єi $\pi \epsilon \rho i \quad \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \delta o ́ \xi o v ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~ \ddot{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho i \quad \chi \alpha \lambda \epsilon \pi o u ̀$
 oion Xoopí̀os
$\nu \hat{\nu} \delta^{\prime}$ öтє $\pi \alpha \dot{\nu} \tau \alpha$ $\delta \in ́ \delta \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha l$.

 when all is spent"' (lit. has been distributed sc.amongst others; and nothing is left for me). [Compare Virgil's omnia iam vulgata in the Exordium of the third Georgic.]

Of the four Choeriluses distinguished by Näke, this is the Epic poet of Samos, born, according to Näke, in B.C. 470. His principal work, from which this fragment is taken, was a poetical narrative of the Persian wars with Greece under Darius and Xerxes-" all that was left him" by his predecessors-very much applauded, as Suidas tell us, and "decreed to be read with Homer." Aristotle (Top. $\Theta$ i, ult. atapadei-
 it was afterwards excluded from the Alexandrian Canon in favour of the poem of Antimachus. An earlier Choerilus was the Athenian tragic poet, contemporary with Phrynichus, Pratinas, and Aeschylus in early life; the third a slave of the Comic poet Ecphantides, whom he is said to have assisted in the composition of his plays; and the fourth, Horace's Choerilus, Ep. II 1. 232, Ars Poet. 357, a later and contemptible epic poet who attended Alexander on his expedition, and according to Horace, incultis qui versibus et male natis rettulit acceptos, regale nomisma, Philippos. Suidas tells this story of the Samian Choerilus, an evident mistake. The fragments of the Choerilus of our text are all collected and commented on by Näke in his volume on Choerilus. This fragm. is given on p. 104. See also Düntzer Epic. Gr. Fragm. p. 96 seq. where five lines of the poem, from which our extract is made are given : and the four articles in Biogr. Dict. The context is supplied by the Schol. on this passage-see in Spengel's ed., Scholia Graeca ${ }^{1}$, p. 160 : printed



 Which are certainly pretty lines enough : perhaps the rest was not equal to them. Compare with $\lambda_{\epsilon} \epsilon \mu \omega \nu$ Movad́ $\omega \nu$, and the whole passage, Lucr. I 925 seq. avia Pieridum peragro loca, nullius ante trita solo, et seq., which might possibly have been suggested by this of Choerilus. An apology of the same kind is introduced by Isocrates in the middle of his Panegyr. § 74 ; and another in his àviסools, § 55. In the latter the word סiate $\theta \rho v \lambda \eta \mu$ évous occurs.
${ }^{1}$ On these Scholia, see Spengel, Praef. ad Rhet., p. viif.
${ }^{2}$ Näke, Choerilus p. 105, thinks that this, and not the second fragm. in § 6as Buhle, Wolf, Vater, agree in supposing-was the opening of the poem. This is rendered probable by the $\lambda o \sigma^{\prime} o \nu{ }^{a} \lambda^{\prime} \lambda o \nu$ in v. 1 , of the other.




 $\delta i \dot{\alpha} \sigma \grave{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha i \quad \tau \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \delta \omega \bar{\omega} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \epsilon i \not \tau \epsilon \sigma \kappa \bar{v} \lambda \alpha$.



[^17]
入ó $\gamma \omega$ ．$\delta \iota \dot{\alpha}$ тои̃то
$\mu \hat{\nu} \nu \iota \nu \quad{ }_{\alpha} \epsilon \iota \delta \epsilon \theta \epsilon \alpha \dot{\alpha}$.
${ }^{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \alpha \mu 0 \iota \epsilon \notin \nu \nu \epsilon \pi \epsilon \mu 0 \bar{v} \sigma \alpha$ ．



 $\lambda о i], \ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \kappa \alpha i$ इофок $\bar{\eta} s$

r． Aóyous $^{2}$ ，fabulae poetarum，meaning the dramas as contrasted with the Epics：the other contrast of prose and verse is more natural as well as more suitable here）＇these prooemia are（present，offer）a specimen or sample of the subject（of the speech or poem）in order that they may have some previous acquaintance with the intention of it＇（if $\bar{\eta} \nu$ ，＇about what it was to be＇，as in rò $\tau_{i} \dot{\eta}^{\eta} \nu$ єivat；the object，purpose，or design），＇and the mind not be kept in suspense；for all that is vague and indefinite keeps the mind wandering（in doubt and uncertainty）：accordingly，（the speaker or writer）that puts the beginning into his hand supplies him with a clue， as it were，by which he may hold，so as to enable him to follow the story（or argument）．This is why（Homer in the Iliad and Odyssey， began the two poems with the lines quoted；and Choerilus－if Näke u．s． is right about the order of the two fragments in our text－did not begin his poem with $\eta^{\prime \prime} \gamma \in \sigma^{\prime} \mu$ o九 к．т．入．，but introduced it in his exordium）＇－here the quotations from the three poems are introduced，and the sentence remains unfinished．
＇Similarly the tragic poets explain the subject of their play，if not immediately at the opening，as Euripides，at any rate somewhere or other the poet explains it in his prologue or introduction），as even Sopho－ cles（who does not usually employ it；in the Oedip．Tyr． 774 seq．）＂Po－ lybus of Corinth was my father，\＆c．＂，and the following．＇
＂The Commentators object to $\pi \rho o \lambda{ }^{\circ} \gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \varphi$ here because the passage that it indicates occurs not at the beginning，but in the middle of the play． But，it seems that Aristotle has here used $\pi \rho o ́ \lambda o y o s ~ i n ~ a ~ m o r e ~ c o m p r e-~$
${ }^{1}$ Spengel puts $\lambda$ ógous $\kappa$ al and $\tilde{\eta}_{\nu}$ in brackets，as spurious or doubtful：Bekker retains $\hat{\eta} \nu$ ．ms $A^{c}$ has $\hat{\eta}$ ．By rejecting the words Spengel seems to shew that he thinks that $\lambda$ dóos alone cannot mean＇stories＇in the sense of dramas．I think it is doubtful．Otherwise，this interpretation is certainly more suitable to the general connexion and what follows．On the other hand，our author here seems to be rather digressive，and not to observe any very regular order of succession in his remarks．So that perhaps upon the whole，we may let the other consideration have its due weight in deciding the point．








hensive sense than that which it usually bears, for an 'explanatory introduction' in general, wherever it may occur: and that it has much the
 $\sigma$ os in c. 13. Also the analogous $\pi \rho o o i \mu t o$ is applied twice in § io infra to introductory speeches anywhere in a play." Introd. p. 339 note.
'And comedy in like manner': that is, wherever an introductory explanation is required, there it is introduced. Victorius notes that this appears in Terence, the Latin representative of the New Comedy, and Plautus. Limo in the Andria, Menedemus in the Heautontimorumenos, Micio in the Adelphi, perform this office. And similarly, Strepsiades in Aristoph. Nubes, Demosthenes in the Equites, 40 seq., Dionysius in the Ranae-Victorius says "tum maxime cum Servo narrate, \&c.," but the conversation referred to is with Hercules, not Xanthias, lines 64 seq. There is another explanatory introduction, preparatory to the dramatic contest between Aeacus and Xanthias, 759 seq.
'So then (to resume) the most necessary function of the prooemium, and that peculiar to it, is to make it clear what is the end and object of the speech or story' (the former is the $\lambda$ óyos in Rhetoric, the latter in the Epic and the drama). Compare Rhet. ad Alex. 29 (30). I, def. of $\pi \rho o o i-$ $\mu$ nov. 'And therefore if the subject (the thing, the matter in hand) be already clear and short (or, of trifling importance) the prooemium is not to be employed'. Comp. Cic. de Or. II 79. 320, in parvis atque infrequentibus causis ab its re est exordivi saepe commodius: Victorious, who writes frequentibus: repeated in Gaisford, Not. Var.
§ 7. 'The other kinds (of prooemia) which are employed are mere cures (remedies [specifics] for the infirmities or defects of the hearers- $\delta$ da т $\grave{\nu} \nu$ тov̂ àkpoatov̂ $\mu 0 \chi$ Ønpiav, III I. 5-such as inattention, unfavourable disposition, and the like), and common', to all parts of the speech. кoivá
 supra: all these other kinds may be introduced in the exordium-and also anywhere else, wherever they are required.
'These may be derived from the speaker himself, from the hearer, the subject, and the adversary' ('the opposite'). Cic. de Or. II 79.32I, seq. Sod gum crit utendum principio, quod plerumque crit, ant ex res, ant ex adversario, naut ex re, naut ex cis apud quos agitur (eck rove
 est-quae significant bonum virum seq. followed by the illustration of



 ávє入єì $\tau \dot{\alpha} \kappa \omega \overline{\text { 人 }}$



1 aữbv

the remaining three. Cicero, who is certainly following Arist., seems here to translate rove $\lambda$ é ${ }^{\prime}$ ouzos by deus, in the sense which he explains, of both parties in the case. Quintilian, IV 1.6, seems to charge Aristotleif he includes him in the plerique who have been guilty of the omissionwith having neglected to include the 'auctor causal' amongst the sources of topics for prooemia. Victorius defends him against this, by pointing out, as Cicero, that $\delta \boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega \nu$ includes both parties in a suit or prosecution, actor as well as revs (in its ordinary sense). See the passage of Quint., with Spalding's note.
'The topics derivable from the speaker himself and the opponent, are all such as relate to allaying (lit. 'refuting') and exciting prejudice and illfeeling (after $\pi o \imath \eta \bar{\sigma} a \iota$ understand au $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\prime} \nu$ ) : but with this difference: that in defending oneself all that relates to $\delta \iota a \beta o \lambda \eta$ ' (i.e. the removal of prejudice and ill-will from ourselves, and exciting them against the opponent) must be put first (subaudi $\lambda_{\epsilon \kappa \tau \in ́ o v, ~ v i z . ~ i n ~ t h e ~ e x o r d i u m), ~ b u t ~}^{\text {en }}$ in the accusation of another reserved for the peroration. The reason of this is not difficult to see; that is, that the defendant, when he is about to introduce his own case, must necessarily begin by doing away with all hindrances (sc. to the establishment of it ; all prepossessions against him on the part of the judge) ; and therefore must make the removal or refutation of all calumnies or prejudices against him his first point; whereas the accuser (the speaker whose office it is to 'set' the defendant 'against' the judges, conciliate their ill-will to him) must reserve all that tends to prejudice his antagonist for the epilogue (peroration, conclusion), that they may better remember it' (that his accusations may 'leave their sting behind them' in the judges' minds). Both Spengel and Beaker write aúróv after cikajeıv for the vulgata lection aúróv ; which as far as appears to the contrary is the reading of all MSS. I think aùróv for 'his own case', lit. himself, is defensible. We often say 'him' for 'himself', leaving the reflexive part to be understood, in our own language. See note on 1 7. 35, and Waitz on Organ. 54 a 14, Vol. I. p. 486, there referred to.
' The topics of the $\pi \rho o o i \mu \iota o \nu$ which are addressed to the hearer (i.e. in the dicastic branch now under consideration, the judges,) are derived from (subaudi yívetal, or as before, $\lambda_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon$ rail) the conciliation of his good will (towards ourselves) and irritating him (exciting his indignation against the adversary, $8 \epsilon i \nu \omega \sigma t s$ ), and sometimes too ( $8 \epsilon$ '), (but only when it is required,) from engaging his attention or the reverse : for it is not always



 expedient to make him attentive，and this is why many（speakers）try to move or provoke him to laughter＇．Hpoáyelv cis $\gamma^{\prime} \lambda \omega \pi a^{\prime}$ ，to move，or

 ＇to carry forward，i．e．stimulate，excite，provoke＇．
eṽovv $\pi o 幺 \eta \sigma a u$ ］＂The three requisites in the disposition of the audience，according to the later writers on the subject，are that they should be benevoli，dociles，attenti．Cic．de Inv．115．20，Quint．IV I． 5 ： and frequently elsewhere．Ar．includes the two latter under one head
 is already inclined to or desirous of learning．The two are closely con－ nected，Cic．de Inv．I 16．23．＂Introd．p．340，note I．

Causa principii nulla est alia，quam ut auditorem，quo sit nobis in ceteris partibus accommodatior，praeparemus．Id feri tribus maxime rebus，inter auctores plurimos constat si benevolum，attentum，docilem fecerimus；non quia ista non per totam actionem sint custodienda，sed． quia initiis praecipue necessaria，per quae in animum iudicis，ut pro－ cedere ultra possimus，admittimur．（Quint．IV I．5）．
 saying that neither of these topics is to be confined to the prooemium § 322，nam et attentum monent Graeci ut principio faciamus iudicem et docilem（this is included in плобeкткоit）；quae sunt utilia，sed non prin－ cipii magis propria quam reliquarum partium；faciliora etiam in prin－ cipiis，quod et attenti tum maxime sunt，quum omnia exspectant，et dociles magis initiis esse possunt．Quint．，iv 1．37，38，criticizes Aristotle＇s remark on this point ：Nec me quanquam magni auctores in hoc duxerint ut non semper facere attentum ac docilem iudicem velim：non quia nesciam，id quod ab illis dicitur，esse pro mala causa qualis ea sit non intelligi：verum quia istud non negligentia iudicis contingit，sed errore． Dixit enim adversarius，et fortasse persuasit ：nobis opus est eius diversa opinione ：quae mutari non potest nisi illum fecerimus ad ea quae dicemus docilem et attentum，seq．That is，the judge＇s inattention often arises not from negligence，but from a mistaken supposition that the adversary is right and we are wrong：in order to set him right we must rouse his attention．The supposition implied here in explanation of ovk áei $\sigma v \mu \phi$ ． к．．．．．，which Quint．refers to and criticizes，is that inattention on the judge＇s part is sometimes expedient when our cause is bad．Quint．＇s reply is，it is not his inattention that would be of use to us in such a case，but his attention to the arguments which we are about to use in order to convince him to the contrary．Another disadvantage that may arise from over－attention on the judge＇s part，occurs when we want to slur over an unfavourable point in our case．In illustration of the following dì̀ $\pi$ गo入入ol $\kappa$ к．．．．．Gaisford very appositely quotes Arist．Vesp．564，





 20, $\gamma \in \lambda \dot{\sigma} \sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon s \dot{a} \phi \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, and Or. 23 § 206.]

The Scholiast on this place (see in Spengel's Ed. p. 158), tells, apropos of this, the story from Demosth. de Cor. $\S \$ 51,52$, with additions. The Scholiast, Ulpian on the passage of Dem., and a scholiast on Ar. Anal. Pr. I $24 b 20$ (in Brandis' collection, Arist. Op. Bekker's 4to. vol. Iv. p. 147 b 43 of Bekker's quarto ed. of Aristotle), all agree that Demosthenes' joke consisted in an intentional mispronunciation of the word $\mu \boldsymbol{\sigma} \theta \omega \tau$ ós, which he applied to Aeschines, pronouncing it $\mu i \sigma \theta \omega$ tos, in order to divert the attention of the audience : he appealed to them to say whether the word was not well applied : they burst into a roar of laughter, accepted the
 pronunciation corrected. I entirely agree with Dissen that this is a foolish and improbable story, absurd in itself, and receiving no countenance from the text of Demosthenes. All that he did say is found in the existing text, viz. that he interpreted Aeschines' $\xi \in \nu i a \nu$ ' $A \lambda \epsilon \xi a \dot{\nu} \delta \rho o v-w h i c h$ Aesch. claimed-as meaning that he was not a $\xi \in \dot{v} o s$, a guest and friend, but a $\mu \boldsymbol{\sigma} \theta \omega \omega$ òs (a hireling) 'A $\lambda \epsilon \xi$ ćvópov and nothing more, and that the people accepted this version. See Dissen's note on § 52.
 speaker may refer to this (carry back, i. e. apply) any thing he pleases (any of the topics of the $\pi \rho o o i \mu \iota \nu)$, even the appearance of worth and
 inclined to attend'. (This is in fact the déer $\eta$ which the speaker must always assume by his speech, in order that his hearers may have confidence in him, that he may have weight and authority with them ; one of

 vided only the speaker treats the other topics of the $\pi \rho o o i \mu$ ov with the view of making the audience docilcs, that is, ready to receive the information which he is prepared to communicate to them.
'The things to which the audience is most inclined to listen are things great (momentous, important), things of special interest (to the hearers themselves), things wonderful (surprising), and things pleasant (to hear ; either in themselves, or in their associations); and therefore the speaker should always try to produce the impression ( $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ in his hearers' minds) that things of such kinds are his subject. If he wish to make them inattentive (he must try to convey the impression, éà $\mu \eta^{\prime}$, subaudi
 to them and their interests (that is, is unimportant in general, or to them in particular: the opposite of the $\tau \dot{a} \boldsymbol{\jmath} 8 \mathbf{\delta} \boldsymbol{a}$ in this preceding topic) or that it is unpleasant'.
 $\lambda \alpha \nu \theta \alpha ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ öть $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha$ є' $\xi \omega$ то̂̀ $\lambda o ́ \gamma o v ~ \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \tau о \iota \alpha u ̄ \tau \alpha . ~$






On interesting and uninteresting topics, see the parallel passages in Rhet. ad Alex. 29 (30). 3, where those of Aristotle are subdivided: Tic. de Inv. I 16. 23: Cis., Ort. Part. c. 8, expresses Ar.'s in sa, Coniuncta cum ipsis apud ques agetur.
§ 8. 'However it must not be forgotten that all such things as these (all these ordinary contents of the $\pi \rho o o i \mu \iota a)$ are foreign to (outside; extra, not secundum, artem) the speech (and its real object, which is the proof
 $\pi \rho o \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} k a t, 1$ I. 3) : it is only because the audience is bad, and ready to listen to things beside the real question, (that these are addressed to them); for if he be not such, there is no occasion for an exordium (to flatter him into a good humour, and the rest), except just so far as to state the case in a summary way, that, like a body, it may have a head on it'. There is probably a reference in this to $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \pi \hat{\eta} s \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega s$, as the enthymemes, or direct logical proofs, are called I 1.3.
$\phi a i ̃ \lambda o s$, as applied to the audience or judges, means here not morally bad, but only defective in intellect and patience, too ignorant and frivolous to attend long to sound and serious reasoning: they require to be relieved and diverted occasionally. So Schrader. Comp. what is said of the 'single judge' in 12.5. Of the summary poi $\mu$ on, the Rhet. ad Alex. 29 (30). 2, gives two examples.




 Phileb. 66 D. Polit. 277 C. Legg. vi 752 A. Stallbaum and Heindorf ad loc. Gory. Thompson ad loc. Phaedri [et Gorge.]. The notion conveyed in all these places is the same, a headless animal is incomplete. See note in Introd. p. 341, on the book, which, without a preface, looks like a man going out into the street without his hat. This gives the same notion of want of finish and completeness. Quint. Iv 1. 72, Haec de prooemio, quoties crit eius usus: non semper autem est; nam et supervacuum aliquando est, si sit praeparatus sati etiam sine hoc index, ant si res praeparatione non egret. Aristoteles quidem in totum id necessarum apud bono indices negat; seq. Comp. XII 10.52, Quod si mini des concilium iudicum sapientum...Neque enim affectus omnino movendi sunt, nee aures delectatione mulcendae, gum etiam prooemia supervacua esse apud tales Aristoteles existimet.
§ 9. 'Besides, this making the hearers disposed to listen (keep up






##  аккпко́атє $\delta \in \iota \nu o ́ v$,




 ${ }^{1}$ out $\dot{\eta}$
their attention), is common to all the parts of the speech alike, wherever it is required : for they are more inclined to relax it anywhere rather than at the opening. It is absurd therefore to fix its place ('post' it) at the beginning, a time when everybody listens with the greatest attention'. Cid. de Or. II 79. 323 quoted on § 7, ova yà ácí $\sigma v \mu \phi \in ́ \rho \epsilon$. Also Quint. Iv. 1. 73, who follows Arist. in quoting Prodicus' artifice. 'And therefore, (not only at the beginning, but) wherever there is occasion, such phrases as this must be used, "And now attend to what I say, for it is no more my affair than yours"; or, "I'll tell such a strange thing-or a thing so marvellous-as you have never yet heard before." And this is like what Prodicus said, "whenever his audience were inclined to be drowsy, he would slip them in a taste of the fifty drachm"'. $\pi a \rho \in \mu \beta a \dot{A} \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$, throw them in by the side of the rest, on the sly, ( $\pi a \rho a \delta \iota \eta \gamma \epsilon i \sigma \theta a t$, infra 16. 5). The 'fifty drachm' was Prodicus' most famous, and interesting,




§ Io. 'But (that all this is beside the point, and extra artem;) that it is not addressed to the hearer as a hearer (read by all means $\dot{\eta} \dot{\boldsymbol{j}}$ ápoarin's sc. $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \iota$ : i. e., that it is addressed to him as a hearer and something more, as a man liable to all the defects and infirmities and feelings above mentoned) 'is plain : for speakers invariably employ their exordia either in prejudicing (the audience against the adversary), or in the endeavour to remove similar apprehensions (of the like suspicions and prejudices) from themselves'. If the audience were mere impartial listeners, met there to hear and judge the case, and nothing more; there would be no occasion for all this accusation and defence with which the orators always fill their prooemia.

The first example referred to, the excuse of the $\phi \dot{v} \lambda a \xi$ for his lack of speed and his unwelcome message, Soph. Antig. 223 seq., is a case
 olpiots.






 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota i \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \bar{u} \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$

## 

 it as long as he can, by a defence': and the application is, that if he had not been afraid of Creon, if he had been quite sure that Creon was an altogether impartial hearer, he would not have indulged in such a long preface. The second is an example of the same kind
 e $\ddagger$ aida $\sigma a \phi \hat{\omega}$ s. The actual defence is confined to one line (1161), but Thoas suspects her of entering upon a long apology. Buhle, who could not have looked at the passage, says "Iphig. logo exordio utentom." The Scholiast (Spengel's Ed. p. 161) here gives a long paraphrase of the watchman's speech. After this, incredible as it may appear, he
 continuation of the line from the Antigone.
'And those who have, or suppose themselves to have, a bad case (lit. their case bad) are apt to indulge in long prooemia: for it is better for them to dwell upon anything rather than upon their case'.-This also is illustrated by the speech of the $\phi \dot{v} \lambda a \xi$ in the Antigone: and perhaps was suggested by it; for it is not very consecutive-'And this is why slaves (when charged with a fault, and excusing themselves to their masters) never answer the questions directly, but (state) the attending (surrounding) circumstances, and make a long (roundabout) preface (before they come to the point)'. On тà кúkतो see 19. 33. Victorius quotes Virg. George. il 45, Non hic te carmine ficto Atque per ambages et Conga exorsa tenebo.
§ ir. 'The topics for conciliating good will have been already stated'

 1 16. 22, benevolentia quattuor ex loci comparatur, seq.) 'as well as (for exciting) any feeling of the same kind in general (any of the $\pi a^{i} \theta_{\eta}$ in Bk. II 2-1I). And since the saying is true, seeing that it is well said "Grant that I may come to the Phaeacians an object of love and pity"Hon. Od. $\eta^{\prime}$ [vil] 327,-it follows that these two (to make ourselves loveable and pitiable) are what we ought to aim at (for this purpose)'.









$\left.\delta \dot{v}{ }^{\circ}\right]$ here is indeclinable, like ${ }^{a} \mu \phi \omega$ sometimes. As only the first four numerals in Greek (and Sanskrit; the first three in Latin) are declinable; 8vo occasionally follows the general rule of indeclinability. In Homer this is the usual form (see Damm's Lex. s. v.) ; in later and Attic writers not so frequent. Several examples are to be found in Ellendt's Lex. Soph., Sturz, Lex. Xen. See Schweighäuser, Lex. Herod. for instances with


 Phoer. 55, \&c.
' In the epideictic prooemia the hearer must be made to suppose that he is a sharer in the praise, either personally, or by his family, or his studies and pursuits, or at any rate somehow or other: for what Socrates (i. e. Plato, Menex. 235 D, supra I 9.30) says in his funeral oration is quite true, that it is easy enough to praise Athenians at (friendly) Athens; the difficulty lies in doing it at Sparta (amongst rivals and enemies)'. The old adj. á $\mu$ ós, 'some', survives in several forms found in most Greek authors; $\dot{\alpha} \mu \hat{\omega} s\left(\gamma^{\prime} \pi \omega s\right)$ and $\dot{\alpha} \mu \hat{\eta}\left(\gamma^{\prime} \pi \eta\right)$, sc. $\dot{\delta} \dot{\phi} \hat{\varphi}, \dot{\alpha} \mu o \hat{v}, \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{o} \theta \epsilon \nu$, and the
 and the same with $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$.
§ 12. 'The exordia of the public oration are borrowed from those of the forensic speech, but are naturally very rare in it: for in fact the subject of it is one with which they are already well acquainted, and therefore the facts of the case require no preface (no preparatory explanation) except-if at all-on his own account or that of the adversary ( $8 i^{\prime}$ aùróv
 àridéरovtas to meet the adversary's charges, combat the prejudices the other has raised against him : both of these therefore are accidental), or in case the subject (this is essential) is not considered by them of the precise degree of importance which you wish, but rated either too high or too low.' As to roùs àvtıへ́́yovtas, we had been told before, c. 13.3,
 mosth. de Corona, and de Falsa Legatione. Comp. Quint. III 8.8, who borrows this from Aristotle, Aristoteles quidem nec sine causa putat et



 oùtov $\gamma$ à $\rho$ тò Гop


a nostra, et ab eius qui dissentiet persona, "duci frequenter in consiliis exordium, quasi mutuantibus hoc nobis a iudiciali genere; nonnunquam etiam ut minor res maiorve videatur: in demonstrativis vero prooemia esse maxime libera existimat.
'And hence the necessity of either raising or doing away with preju. dice (8có, because when there is an adversary, as there always is in dicastic practice, the same treatment in deliberative speaking is necessarily required) and (the topics) of amplification and diminution (to meet

 18.4.
'These are the circumstances in which a preface is required (ofirat, ó $\lambda_{o ́ y o s, ~ o r ~}^{\delta} \lambda^{\prime} \dot{\gamma}(\omega \nu)$; either these, or for mere ornament's sake, because, without it, the speech has an off-hand, slovenly (impromptu, extemporaneous) air (note on III 7. 1). For such is Gorgias' encomium on the Eleans; without any preliminary sparring (flourish) or preparatory stirring up he starts abruptly (rushes at once, in medias res; without any previous warning or preparation) with "Elis, blessed city."
 No. IV. Nothing more is known of the speech.
$\pi \rho o \kappa \xi a \gamma \kappa \omega \nu i \sigma a s]$ is a metaphor from boxing, and denotes a preliminary exercise of the boxer, a swinging, and thrusting to and fro of the arms (lit. elbows), as a preparation for the actual blow, "ex athletarum disciplina ... qui bracchiis sublatis et vibratis pugnae proludunt (I think this is not quite exact: the exercise is not so much to prepare for the encounter with the antagonist, though this of course may be included, as to give weight and impetus to the actual blow). Hinc ab Ar. ad oratorem traductum, qui prooemio quodam utitur priusquam ad rem ipsam deveniat." Spanheim ad Callim. Hymn. Del. line 322. This word is a äraॄ̧ $\lambda \in \gamma o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \nu$.

тpoavaxıveiv expresses much the same thing by a different metaphor; the rousing, stirring $u p$, excitement of emotion or interest, as a preparation ( $\pi \rho_{0}$ ) for what is to follow. This is illustrated by Plato, Legg.

 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \delta ~ \mu e ́ \lambda \lambda o \nu \pi \in \rho a i v e \sigma \theta a u$. Ib. vil 789 c , of the inspiriting, animating, exciting process-'quo validiores atque animosiores ad certamina fierent,' Stallbaum ad locun-which is the object of the training of fighting
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## I




 $\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega \hat{\nu}$ as, here literally, in the primary sense, the Numidians were already

 or study, these sensible elements (of Empedocles \&c.)-from all which it seems to me certain that Victorius is incorrect in interpreting this in the same way as the preceding metaphor, "brachia manusque commovere et concutere." Ernesti, Lex. Techn. Gr. s. v., proludere prooemio quodam, throws no light upon the matter.

CHAP. XV.
The following chapter is a continuation of the preceding on the ordinary contents of the $\pi$ pooimov, two of which, as we have seen $c$.
 supplied with topics.

The same subject is treated in the Rhet. ad Alex. c. 29 (30), at even greater length than by Aristotle: and a summary of its contents, with some remarks on its moral character, and its connexion with Isocrates, may be found in Introd. pp. 441-443. A comparison of this with Aristotle's treatment of the subject is altogether in favour of the latter. He had already told us that he disapproves of the $\pi p o o i \mu c o$, as distinct from the $\pi \rho^{\prime} \theta \in \sigma$ ts, altogether: but he is obliged, by the practice of his predecessors, and the evident importance of the subject, which in spite of its unscientific character cannot be altogether passed over in a complete treatise on Rhetoric, to give it a place in his system; but it will be observed that in dealing with it he occupies at least threefourths of the chapter with the topics of the defensive use of it, confining his observations on the aggressive side to two topics in a single section.
 and unscrupulous precepts of the other treatise present $\delta<a \beta 0 \lambda \eta$ in its very worst character: it is truly here the 'devil's art', $\dot{\eta}$ roû diaßó入ov
 against your opponent-merely because he happens to be such, and for no other reason-and so prejudicing his case. There is something further on this in c. 36 (37). 46, 47. There is an invective against 8 oa$\beta_{0} \lambda \eta$ in Isocr. àvrį. § 18. " $\delta 1 a \beta \dot{\beta} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ is 'to set at variance', 'to make hostile'; and so to inspire ill-will, insinuate suspicions, or prejudice a person against another. It applies as a technical term to all insinuations and accusations by which one of the parties in a case endeavours to raise a prejudice against the other, which are to be reflected upon, but do not directly help to prove, the main charge or point at issue ; and are
 example, infra § 3. áno入v́є $\sigma \theta a t$ is to clear oneself of such insinuated charges, to remove evil suspicions. Aristotle begins with this, because, as he told us before (c. 14. 7), it is more appropriate to the exordium, as the opposite (in accusation) is to the peroration." Introd. p. 344.





§ I．＇With respect to סoaßo $\eta$＇，（intentional and malicious）calumny or（accidental，undesigned）prejudice，one（the first）topic is anything from which arguments may be derived for removing offensive（unplea－ sant，injurious）suspicion：for it makes no difference whether（the charge or insinuation）has been actually spoken（expressed，in the shape of a direct personal calumny）or not＇（i．e．has merely been conceived；not openly stated ；vimó入$\eta \psi$ ıs as a mere conception or supposition－against us by inference，from our words，actions，or manners，or altogether acci－ dentally，when people have a bad opinion of us：in either case the prejudice requires to be removed）；＇and therefore this is a general rule＇； includes everything，every kind of argument which tends to remove any bad opinion or prejudice which for whatever reason may be entertained against us：and this，whether the charge we have to meet be a direct statement，or merely an uncertified suspicion．This is illustrated by Rhet．ad Alex． 29 （30）．8， 9

In Benseler＇s Isocrates，in 276，a ref．is given upon סoaßo $\lambda \boldsymbol{\eta}$ to Isocr． ríxul，Fragm．ríxy．No． 2 （from Anon．et Maxim．Planud．V 551．10，
 （establish）каі̀ тà тầ ìvavtion dıaßä入入o

§ 2．＇Another way（of clearing oneself）is to meet the charge on any
 case，on which issue is joined ：on these see Appendix E to Book III in Introd．p． 397 seq．where the various classifications of them are given；） ＇either by denying the fact（rò örb，status，coniecturalis）；or admitting that，and asserting that the alleged act was not injurious（abutili，Vic－ torius）；or at any rate not to him（the complainant）；or that the amount of injury is overstated；or that it was either no wrong at all（not unjust： not a legal crime），or a slight one ；or，（taking the other view of morality， supposing it to be strictly speaking unjust，at any rate）not disgraceful， or a mere trifle，of no importance at all＇．où $\mu$＇́jua differs in this from ovik \＃xov $\mu$＇́ve日os：the former qualifies merely the wrong of the äducov，the latter is ＂no great matter＂；of greatness，in the sense of magnitude or importance in general．＇For these are the points upon which the issue（of a case） turns，as in that between Iphicrates and Nausicrates：for he admitted the fact and the injury，but said it was no zurong＇．Nausicrates or（always in the Latin Rhetoricians）Naucrates，is mentioned by Cicero，Orat．L 172，de Orat．II 23．94，and III 44 173，as a pupil of Isocrates．Quint．，III 6．3，stating the same fact，tells us also that some attributed to him the first systematic division of these oriocts or status．See Art．in Biogr． Dict．s．v．Westermann＇s Gesch．der Gr．iu．Röm．Beredtsamkeit，50．5， comp．83．Io．






Spalding，on Quint．III 6．60，retains the vulgata lectio roûro（instead

 from the Tragic poets collected by Monk ad Eur．Hippol．1323，Kúnpıs




 ©̈бrє，where see Heindorf＇s note，and also on Phaedr． 269 D，tò 8úvac⿴at

 $\mu \eta \delta^{\prime} \eta^{\eta} \nu$ ®̈नt＇$^{2} \delta \in i \nu$ ätavras（with Shilleto＇s critical note）．Aesch．de F．L．p． 49





${ }^{4}$ Or（in justifying oneself），admitting a wrong done，to balance（or y compensate）it（by something else which may be taken as a set－off，or drawback，in diminution of the wrong）；for instance you say，what I did was injurious no doubt，but honourable；or painful，but serviceable；or anything else of the same sort＇．The comparison of a few passages will best illustrate the meaning of àvtıкara入入árтєöat．Ar．de part．Anim．I $5.3,644 b 22$ ．The author is comparing the interest and value in natural philosophy of the objects of sense，things that we can see and touch and handle，and so examine and satisfy our curiosity about，with those that àre beyond the reach of our senses，ovoias áyevírovs kal à $\phi$ Aáprovs ròv ä̃aעтa aî̀va．Though the latter are in themselves higher and more excellent，＂yet by their greater nearness to us，and more immediate con－ nexion with our nature，there is a sort of compensation，àvtcкaгa入入átreraí $\tau \iota$ ，when they are compared with the things divine as objects of study．＂







 cusare reum！）
§3．＇Another method is（to extenuate the $\boldsymbol{a} 8 i \kappa \eta \mu a$ by the milder







terms), (to say) that it is a mistake, or an accident, or compulsory', done : under compulsion : Bia, see I 10. 14, and Appendix C to Bk. I., Introd. p. 225, and the references there. $\dot{\nu}{ }^{2} \dot{\gamma} \gamma \eta$ or $\beta i a$, 'overpowering force', forza maggiore, force majeure, absolves from responsibility. Four degrees of cri-1
 a mere accident, an injury done unintentionally without knowledge of the special circumstances of the case: (2) á $a^{\prime} p$ r $\eta \mu a$, an error or mistake, where the act is intentional but the injury unintentional (the case of killing a friend with a gun supposed not to be loaded); this does not include the case of moral ignorance, ignorance of right and wrong, for which a man is responsible: (3) a 8 ikn $\mu$, a wrong, intentional in a sense, but without deliberation or malice prepense, as a deadly blow dealt in a fit of passion, when the judgment is for the moment overpowered; (this is, I believe; the only place in which this degree is distinguished from the following: at all events the ordinary division is threefold.) All these are short of actual guilt or crime. The last stage, of actual crime, is (4) dibixia, a wrong act committed with full knowledge of the circumstances, and
 compare III 2, on the intentional and unintentional. Comp. also Rhet. ad Alex. 4 (5). 8, 9.
'As for instance Sophocles said that his trembling was not, as his acruser (or traducer) said, assumed to convey the appearance of old age; (and thereby obtain the sympathy and compassion of the judges) but compulsory (and therefore he was not responsible for it); for his eighty years were quite unintentional'. On Sophocles-not the poet-see note on I 14.3. The same Sophocles is mentioned again III 18.6.
'And again, by a balance (compensatory interchange or substitution) of motives; (for instance) that you had no intention of injuring him; what you really intended to do was so and so, and not that which was falsely laid to your charge; the injury was an accident (not of the essence of what you did: a mere $\sigma \nu \mu \beta \epsilon \beta \eta \kappa o ́ s)$. "I should deserve to be hated if that were my intention in doing it"'. This seems to be introduced as a specimen of what might be said on such an occasion; and contrary to his usual practice, Aristotle's own manufacture.
§ 4 'Another (way or topic) is recrimination, when the accuser is involved in the same charge, either at the present time or on some previous occasion ; either himself or any of those near to him (relatives, connexions, intimate friends)'. If you can shew that your adversary or any one very near to him is liable to the same charge as that of




 1 fortasse transponendum aut prorsus onittendum.
which he accuses you, though the charge may not therefore fall to the ground, at any rate you can silence him by saying, that he at all events was not the person to make it. Majoragius cites Cic. pro Ligar. § 2. Habes igitur, Tubero, quod est accusatori maxime optandum, confitentem reum, sed tamen ita confitentem, se in ea parte fuisse, qua te, Tubero, qua virum omni laude dignum, patrem tuum. Itaque prius de vestro delicto confiteamini necesse est, quam Ligarii ullam culpam reprehendatis. He adds that the whole of the exordium of the fifth action against Verres is to prove, neminem debere alterum accusare de ea re qua ipse sit infectus.
§ 5. 'Again, if others are included in the charge who are admitted not to be liable to the accusation ; for instance if (it be argued) that so and so is an adulterer because he is a smart dresser, (the reply is) why in that case so must Smith and Jones be adulterers'-although it is perfectly well known that Smith and Jones are entirely free from that vice. Bekker and Spengel accept Riccoboni's, and Bekker's own, suggestion kaÁpıos for vulgata lectio kaAapós : but they retain the article $\delta$ in its old position órı kaAaptos ó $\mu$ olxós. With this reading the only translation can be, "that all adulterers dress smartly", which is not to the point. The canverse is required by the argument-which is, to free yourself from a suspicion which has arisen from some accidental association, by shewing that, if the two things were really associated, others would be liable to the same suspicion, who are known not to be obnoxious to it : "if, as is alleged, all smart dressers were adulterers, then so and so, who are known not to be liable to the charge, would be involved in it" : and besides this, the following passages on the same subject shew that this was the argument that was used. nä'pios, II 4. 15, for 'neatness and cleanliness in dress' and attention to personal appearance : the



 into kaAápos, either to change the position of the article, ei örı ó кaÁápos $\mu o x$ ós or $^{\text {or }}$ to omit the article altogether ai örı kađápos $\mu \circ$ oxós. If such a mistaken inference has been drawn, you infer from this example by exalogy to a like case.
§ 6. 'Again, if (your accuser) ever brought against others (the same) charges (which he is now bringing against you); or if, without a direct accusation, these same were ever subjected to the same suspicions as you yourself are now; who have been shewn to be entirely innocent of them'-you may infer by analogy that a similar mistake is likely to have been made in the present case.




 $\kappa є \lambda \epsilon \dot{\nu} \omega \nu$ ย̇тьоркєì̀



§ 7. 'Or again, (another topic may be derived) from recrimination, by a retort upon the accuser: (the inference being, that) it is strange that where (in what, 0 ,) a man himself is not to be trusted, his statemints should be trustworthy'. MSS $\dot{o}$ aùtós, Dekker Ed. 3, and Spengel (apparently from Beaker) ${ }^{\circ}$ s. I read $\dot{z}$ as nearer to the text, 'in what'.
§ 8. 'Another is, the appeal to a previous decision ; an instance of which is Euripides' reply to Hygiaenon, in the exchange case, in which the latter accused him of impiety for the verse that he wrote in reconmendation of perjury, "the tongue hath sworn; but the mind is unsworn". His reply was that the other had no right to bring cases (decisions) out of the Dionysiac contest into the courts of law: for he had already given an account (stood his trial) of them (his words, ait $\bar{\omega} \hat{\nu}$, included in the verse), or was prepared to do so, if the other chose to accuse him'. This celebrated verse, Hippol. 608, probably owes a good deal of its notoriety to Aristophanes' parody of it near the end of the Frogs. Seldom has so "much ado about nothing" been made as about this unlucky line. The charge of recommending perjury is at any rate a gross exaggeration. Nor does it necessarily imply even mental reservation. Cicero, de Off. III 29.107 (quoted by Monk ad lac.), puts the case very clearly. Quod ta iuratum est ut mans conciperet fieri oportore, id servandum est: quod alter, id si non feceris nullum est periurium. Non enid falsum curare periurare est; led quod ex animi tui sententia iuraris, scut verbis concipitur more nostro, id non facere periurium est. Site enim Euripides, Iuravi lingua, mentem iniuratam gera. See the whole of Monk's note. Paley in his note follows Cicero. Of course the deceit, if there be any, lies in the intention and not in the word ; and this is all that Hippolytus seems to say. He never intended that his oath should be kept in that sense: and his ignorance of the circumstances absolves him from the responsibility, or obligation of the oath. See above in note on $\S 3^{1}$.

We learn from this passage that Euripides (the tragic poet) was
${ }^{1}$ I find this note in one of my copies of the Hippolytus. "I don't think the principle implied in this (the verse of Eurip.) can be defended. Hippolytus says that he swore to keep the secret in ignorance of the nature of it : now that he knows that, he is freed from the obligation of keeping it. Has a man a right to lay himself under an obligation, of the nature of which he is ignorant ?" However the question still remains, if the oath has been taken in ignorance, is he still bound to keep it? The last sentence was added when this Commentary was written.







capable of pleading a cause in public．Another public speech，in an embassy to Syracuse，is attributed to him in II 6.20 ult．，where see note．

On the àviסoots，the compulsory＇exchange of property＇，in the case of an unfair assignment of a liturgy at Athens，see Böckh Publ．Econ． Bk．IV．ch．i6．It does not appear from the text which of the two par－ ties it was that proposed the exchange．

Valckenaer ad Hippol．612，p．232，would change the name in the text to＇ $\mathbf{Y y}$ ıaiveroy，as more agreeable to the analogy of Greek proper names． The name is right．Harpocr．quotes twice the speech of Hyperides

§ 9．＇Another（may be borrowed）from the accusation of calumny and malicious insinuation itself，（shewing）its enormity（magnitude，how great it is）－and this in particular that it raises extraneous points for decision＇（ä $\lambda \lambda$ as different from，foreign to，the question at issue：like Hy－ giaenon＇s quotation in the last section，which may perhaps have sug－ gested this topic．This seems to fix the meaning of ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \lambda a s$ and so Victo－ rius：otherwise it might be＂gives rise to other trials，＂one trial gene－ rated out of another ad infinitum）；＇and because it places no reliance on the facts of the real matter at issue＇．Comp．Rhet．ad Alex． 29 （30）．12，
 terms．
＇Common to both（rథ̂ סıaßá入入оутı кal àmo入oyovnévq）is the topic of signs and tokens：as，for example，in（Sophocles＇）Teucer，Ulysses charges him with being closely connected with Priam（i．e．with the enemy：closely connected in a double sense：it is an inference from his connexion by blood to his political connexion，to his favouring the cause of Priam）；for Hesione（Teucer＇s mother）was his（Priam＇s）sister＇：the other（Teucer）replies（in the same topic）that his father＇（a still nearer relation．See Apollo＇s speech in Aesch．Eumen．657－673 and in many other places，on the nearer connexion，and higher obligation，of the son to the father than to the mother）＇Telamon，was Priam＇s enemy，and also that he did not betray（inform against）the spies to him＇．This play of Sophocles has already been named before－in II 23．7．There are only two short fragments of it remaining（Dind．，Wagn．Soph．Fragm．），from

[^18]







which absolutely nothing is to be learned as to the plot of the play. It is clear from this passage, that Ulysses' accusation was that Teucer had betrayed the Greek cause, and had dealings with the enemy. The charge is supported by the sign of Teucer's connexion-in the double sense above explained-with Priam; and met by the other with two signs or tokens leading to the opposite inference. Wagner, Soph. Fragm. (Fr. Trig. Gr. I, 385-391, Tev̂кpos), supposing that Pacuvius "Soph. fabulam imitation expressisse", collects a number of his fragments from various Latin writers, from which he derives an interpretation of the story of the play, totally different-as,he candidly admits-from that which we shall gather from this passage. But as the interpretation of this passage is perfectly clear, and his hypothesis altogether the reverse, uncertain in every particular, there is little doubt which of the two is to be preferred for the elucidation of Ar.'s text-provided we confess our entire ignorance of all else in and about the play in question.
§ 10. 'Another, for the accuser, is to praise some trifle at great length, and then (under cover of that) to introduce in concise (and greg. nat) terms a censure of something that is of real importance; or after a preliminary enumeration of a number of advantages (virtues and accomplishments, which have little or nothing to do with the point at issue) hold up that one thing to censure which has a direct and real bearing on the question'. $\pi \rho \circ \phi^{\prime} \rho \in t \nu$, to promote (carry forward), aid, assist, fur-




Victorius illustrates the topic by Hor. Sat. I 4.94 seq. and the following well-known passage from Cic. pro L. Flacco, IV 9. Verumtamen hoc disco de toto genere Graccorum: tribuo illis litteras: do multarum artium disciplinam: non adimo sermonis leporem, ingeniorum acumen, dicendi copiam: denique etiam, si qua sibi alia sumunt non repugno: testimoniorum religionem et fidem nunquam ista natio coluit: totiusque huius rei quale sit wis, quale auctoritas, quod pondus, ignorant.
${ }^{4}$ (Topics) such as these are at the same time most artful and most unfair: for they endeavour to do harm with what is good (to convert the good into an instrument of mischief) by mixing it with the bad'; like one who mixes poison with wholesome food. 'Another topic common to both accuser and excuser is, that since the same act may always be attri-







1



buted to several (different) motives, the accuser has to depreciate (disparage, put a bad character or construction upon) it, by selecting the worse (lit. by directing his selection to what is worse), the apologist to put the more favourable interpretation upon it' (interpretari in peius, in melius).

 $\lambda a \mu \beta a ́ v e \not v-t e c h n i c a l l y$ applied to the selection of topics-are illustrated by Poste, Post. Anal, p. 21, n. 1, and p. 121, n. I. Similarly we have ik-

 s. vv. Poet. Xvil 5, ékri $\theta \in \sigma \theta a l$. Ar. Pol. iv (vil) 13, sub init. ó $\sigma$ кomòs ढ̈ккєเгаเ ка入шิ, "the mark stands well out, full in view, prominent." Lite-



' For instance, (to say) that Diomede preferred Ulysses (to be' his companion in the nocturnal adventure), on the one side because he supposed Ulysses to be the best (i.e. the most valiant) of men (or the best companion, for such an occasion), on the other, not for that reason, but because, from his worthlessness, he was the only (one of the heroes) of whose rivalry he (Diom.) was not afraid'. Supra II 23. 20, 24 : where the same case is given, and the two sides opposed, in illustration of two different topics. See Hom. Il. K [X] 242 seq.
'And so much for the treatment of $8 \iota a \beta 0 \lambda \eta$ '.

## CHAP. XVI.

On the various divisions of the parts of the speech, including $8 \eta^{\prime} \eta_{-}$ $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma t s$, the special subject of the following chapter, see the introductory remarks to c. 13, Introd. p. 331 seq., and in the Commentary.


 тoîs $\sigma v \mu \beta a \lambda \lambda о \mu e ́ v o t s ~ \grave{\eta} \mu i ̂ \nu ~ \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau \in ́ o \nu ~(f r o m ~ S y r i a n u s, ~ S o p a t e r, ~ a n d ~ A n o n . ~ a p . ~$ Walz, Benseler Isocr. Il 276, àmoanáa. No. 3); Rhet. ad Alex. 36 (37).








 80 §§ 326-330. Orat. xxxv 122, 124. Orat. Part. 1x 31, 32. de Inv. 1 19. 27-21. 30. By Quintilian narratio is treated in great detail in IV 2. [Volkmann, die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer, §§ $11-27$, esp. § 13, die Ersählung.]
§ 1 . ' In the epideictic branch of Rhetoric narration is not consecutive but fragmentary'. ov'к ' $\boldsymbol{\phi} \epsilon \xi \hat{\eta} s$, not continuous, one part of it following the other in a regular series or succession, but broken up into parts, piecemeal, кarà $\mu$ épos, to aid the memory by giving opportunity for proving each point of laudation as it arises. 'For we have to go through' (narrate, or enumerate in detail ; there must be a narration;) 'all the actions which form the subject of the panegyric' (lit. out of which the speech, i. e. the praise conferred by the speech, is made to arise: the
 B to Bk. 1 c. 9, Introd. p. 212 seq.): 'for the speech is constructed with (or from) one element with which art is not concerned-because the speaker is not the author of the actions he praises' (art is praductive, Eth. Nic. Vi 4. The speaker has not made his materials himself : he finds them ready to his hand, and uses them. These are the ärčvos riorets of 115 )-' and another which is derived from the (rhetorical) art (these are the èvee $\chi$ vot $\pi$ iovets, the inferences which are derived from the materials) ; and this (the latter) is to prove either the fact, if it be incredible, or that it is of a certain quality, or quantity (amount, magnitude, importance), or all three'.
§ 2. 'And it is this character of an epideictic speech (this necessary admixture of inference with statement of facts) that sometimes obliges the speaker not to relate everything seriatim (one after another, in continuous, uninterrupted order), because a proof of this kind (a long series of statements followed by a still longer series of proofs, which after the first two or three topics would be difficult to recollect in their proper connexion, so as to fit them together,) would be difficult to retain in the memory. From this set of topics he (the hero) is to be shewn to be brave, from the others to be wise or just, (and the proofs of these would get intermixed and confounded in the hearer's memory). And the speech by this arrangement of topics (oitos) is simpler; by the other it is made puzzling (prop. parti-coloured, and so by the variety, perplexing) and not smooth' (i. e. plain and easy- like a smooth surface to walk or drive over).

##  $\delta_{\iota}$ ò oi mo入入  

$\lambda_{\imath t}$ ós] connected with $\lambda_{\imath} \sigma \sigma$ ós and $\lambda_{c}$ îos. The metaphor is from a smooth and easily travelled road; like the road to vice, smooth and
 Op. et D. 287-292 : and Euripides' style, in Archimelus' epigram, An-

 xutép $\sigma$ кó̀otos. It is applied frequently by Dionysius to style in the
 init., the terms $\lambda_{\iota r \eta}$ кai à $\phi \varnothing \lambda \lambda_{j}$ s are applied to a style like that of Lysias, plain, smooth, simple, easy, opposed to the rough, rugged, contortions of that of Thucydides. In de vet. script. cens. c. 2 § 11 , it is opposed to





§ 3. 'Of well-known actions the hearer should merely be reminded (they should merely be suggested, by a brief allusion, not dwelt upon); and therefore most people ${ }^{1}$ (i.e. men of ordinary education) in such cases don't require a regular narrative of them'-everybody at once remembers that Achilles conquered Hector; people only need to be reminded of that-'as for instance, if you want to praise Achilles: for his actions are known to everybody, they only require to be employed (that is, to be enlarged upon, and commented, for the purpose of enhancing their glory). If Critias is to be praised (or censured), he does want one: for not many people know anything about him'. Critias too-one of the Thirty-was a famous man in his day: one wonders that he should have been so entirely forgotten in Aristotle's time. Pericles and Alcibiades still lived fresh in men's memories; though I don't mean that the three were absolutely on a level in contemporary reputation.
 gap in the mSS, including $A^{\circ}$, which has been filled up with an extract from I 9 , on $\begin{aligned} & \text { tavaos, } \S \$ 33-97 \text {. Comp. Spengel, in a paper on the }\end{aligned}$ Rhet. ad Alex. in Zeitschrift fïr Alt. Wiss. 1840, p. 1226. Bekker's Variae Lectiones include $\mathrm{A}^{\circ}$ with the rest, as having the interpolated passage : Buhle, ad h. 1., says "in nearly all the Edd. except that of Victorius and his followers," the interpolation is found.

The abrupt transition from the epideictic to the dicastic branch had already made Vettori (for once I will give him his proper name) suspect
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 a lacuna. The words wî̀ $\begin{gathered}\text { eff } \\ \text {, which have no reference to anything pere- }\end{gathered}$ ceding, suggest the same conclusion.
§ 4. Something is here lost. 'But as it is, it is absurd to say' (as the writers on Rhetoric do in their treatises; and especially Isocrates) 'that the narration ought to be rapid'. This precept is suggested in Rhet. ad Alex. 6 (7).3, in the word Bpaxvioyia; and 30 (31).4, it is further recommended that the narrative of a $\delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma o p i a$ should be $\beta \rho a x i a$ and $\sigma$ vivтouos. See Spengel's note on ed. of Anaximenes' Ars Rhet., pp. 214, 5 : and 219. Tic. de Orat. II 80. 326. Quint. IV 2. 31, 32, (Narrationem) plerique scriptores, maxime qui sunt ab Isocrate, volunt esse lucidam, brevem, verisimilem....Eadem nobis placet divisio; quanquam et Aristoteles ab Isocrate in parte una discesserit, praeceptum brevitatis irridens, tanquam necesse sit longam aut brevem esse expositionem, rec liceat ire per medium. From Plato Phaedr. 267 A, it appears that this precept appeared in rhetorical treatises as early as those of Tisias and Gorgias; and a remark of Prodicus, to precisely the same effect as that of the customer to the baker here, is quoted, 267 B . The precept, that it should be бvivтomov, is found also in Dionysius de Leys. Iud. c. 18, (p. 492 R ) : probably taken from Isocrates. (Spengel's Artium Scriptores, p. 158).

The extract from Isocrates, on this quality of the don 'rn $\sigma t s$, is quoted at the commencement of this chapter. This is one of Vettori's evidences (perhaps the best) of Aristotle's dislike of Isocrates. This subject is discussed in Introd. pp. 4r-45, and the probability of the hypothesis reduced to a minimum. If they ever were enemies-as is likely enough in Ar.'s early life-after the death of Isocrates, by the time that this work was completed and published, all trace of hostility (yedoios $\phi a \sigma$ iv can at the worst hardly imply hostility) must have long vanished from Arisetote's mind.
'And yet-just as the man replied to the baker when he asked him whether he should knead his dough (rìv $\mu a ́ \zeta a \nu)$ hard or soft', "what", said he, " is it impossible to do it well ?"-so here in like manner: that is to say ( $\gamma$ af), the narration should be no more over long ${ }^{2}$ than the proof-
${ }^{1}$ Spengel, Art. Script. 169 note, has discovered here some fragments of a

 in the first line.]
${ }^{2}$ It would be difficult to assign any sufficient reason (in point of the sense) for making the distinction of $\mu \boldsymbol{y}$ and oi $\delta \boldsymbol{\ell}$ here; though we may say, grammatically, of course, that the $\mu t$ is joined immediately with the inf. mood, whereas the two out $\delta$-s following require $\delta \epsilon \hat{i}$ to be supplied after them in each case.

 кє́val, $\hat{\eta}$ Tn







 mium should be over-long, or the proofs: for neither in these two cases does the excellence consist in the rapidity or conciseness, but in the observation of the due mean : and that is, to say just so much-and no more-as will clearly explain the facts of the case, or will (make the judge suppose) establish in the judge's mind the conviction of their having occurred, (the question of fact, rò on ${ }^{\circ} \tau t$ ), or that by them injury has been done (harm and loss) or wrong (according to the status or issue which you wish to raise): or (as will produce on him the impression, make him suppose them, of any amount or magnitude that you please (to estimate them at): or the opposites of these, for the opponent', if he be the pleader.
§ 5. 'You may slip into your narrative (bring in by a side wind, on the sly, $\pi u \rho \epsilon \mu \beta$ aid $\lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$, sub ra c. 14.9) anything that tells to the advantage of your own character-as for instance, "and I always admonished him to do what was right, not to leave his children behind him in the lurch" (in distress and difficulty), or to the disadvantage of your opponent's; "but he made answer to me, that wheresoever he was himself, there would he find other children:" the answer, as Herodotus tells us, of the revolted Egyptians (to the king who was inviting them to return).' The story of the latter part of the alternative is told by Herodotus II 30, with the addition of certain circumstances, which add indeed to its graphic character, but cannot be here repeated. Aristotle seems to have tacked on the first part of the alternative-out of his own head-to make a little "imaginary conversation." 'Or (to slip in) anything else that is likely to be agreeable to the judges'.
§ 6. 'In defence'-when you have to narrate circumstances in order to correct an opponent's statement of the facts-' the recital may be shorter (because most of the story has been already told by the other), and as the issues ( $\dot{a} \mu \phi \iota \sigma \beta \eta \tau_{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \epsilon \epsilon s$ is Arist.'s term for what were afterwards called $\sigma$ rá⿱宀ects, status) are (on the defensive side) the denial either of the fact, or the injury, or the wrong, or the degree (the estimated amount of the crime and penalty), we must therefore waste no time upon proving what is already admitted, unless it (the proofs of any of the facts) chance






 to contribute to the establishment of the issue (on which we do rest our case); for instance, when we admit the fact, but deny the wrong'. Though on the other hand, it may be necessary, whilst we admit the facts of our opponent's case, still to go over that ground, in order to clear up points which have a bearing upon the justice of the act which is acknowledged to have been done.
§ 7. 'Events should generally be recited as past and gone-except those which by being acted' (represented as actually done, passing before the eyes, $\pi \rho \grave{̀} \dot{\partial} \boldsymbol{j} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \mathbf{a}^{\tau} \omega \nu$, note on III II. 2,) ' may afford an opportunity for exciting either commiseration or indignation '. סeiv $\sigma \chi \epsilon \tau \lambda_{\iota} a \sigma \mu{ }^{\circ} s$, are two ordinary 'common topics', (subordinate varieties of $a v ँ \xi \eta \sigma \iota s$ and $\mu \epsilon i \omega \sigma \iota s$, ) of appeals to the feelings in use amongst rhetoricians. See notes on II 21. IO, and 24.4 Of Thrasymachus, and his use of these in his Rhetoric, Pl. Phaedr. $267 \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{D}$, and of the early rhetoricians in general, Ib. 272 A, where $\beta$ paxudoyia is joined with the other two.
'An example of this is "the story of Alcinous," (it is an example) because it is told ( $\pi \in \pi$ ointal, composed, written) to Penelope in sixty verses', i. e. the long story of Ulysses' wanderings, which occupies in the narration of it to the Phaeacians four whole books of the Odyssey, IXX1I, is condensed by Ulysses, when he repeats it to Penelope, Od. $\psi^{\prime}$ [XXIII] 264-284, 310-343, into a summary of 55 verses-which here (with the characteristic inaccuracy of the ancient writers in calculations and descriptions of all kinds) are called in round numbers sixty-and thus furnishes a good example of the summary treatment required in an ordinary narrative. Vater, who explains all this in his note, understates the actual number by two. "Hi versus quinquaginta et tres numero rotundo

'And as Phayllus reduced (condensed: émoinge, I suppose, must bel understood from $\pi \in \pi o i \eta \tau a$, , composed') the Epic cycle: and Euripides' prologue to the Oeneus'. These three cases are appealed to as wellknown instances of concise summaries. The 'a $\lambda_{\text {aivov ànódoyos, in its }}$ original form, when given at length with all its details, became proverbial

 same proverbial application. See Ast and Stallbaum ad locum. The 'A入кivov ámó入oyos appears in Aelian's list of $\dot{\rho} a \psi \omega \delta i a t$ into which the Homeric poems were divided for recitation (Var. Hist. XIII 13, $\pi$. 'O $\boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ 'pov $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ кai $\pi o \neq \eta \quad \sigma \epsilon \omega s$, quoted by Paley, Pref. to Hom. Il. p. xlvii). It is


Of Phayllus nothing whatever is known. It seems that this is the






only place in which his name occurs; neither is it to be found in Smith's Biogr. Dict. We gather from the notice of him here, that whether poet or rhapsodist, he attempted to reduce the whole of the Epic Cycle into a brief summary. F. A. Wolf is so staggered by the overwhelming labour of such a task that he prefers to read Kúk $\omega \omega \pi a$, from a correction in one of the MSS; overlooking the fact that $\tau \dot{\partial} \nu \mathbf{\nu}$ K $\dot{\kappa} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda \omega \pi a$ is not in point here; tò̀ кúk $\lambda o \nu$, which gives a second instance of a summary, is.

The third example is the prologue to Euripides' Oeneus. Four lines and a half of this are to be found in Wagner's collection, Fragm. Eurip. p. 290, On. Fr. I. and Dindorf, Eur. Fr. Oeneus. They are written with Euripidean compactness, and seem to justify their citation for this purpose.
§ 8. 'The narrative should have an ethical cast: this will be effected when (if) we know what imparts this ethical character. One thing in particular that does so, is any indication of a moral purpose (II 21.16, III 17.9, Poet. VI 24) : it is by (the quality of) this that a moral quality is given to character: and the quality (good or bad) of the moral purpose 'is determined by the end'. On $\pi \rho o a i \rho \epsilon \sigma$ Is, see Eth. Vic. III cc. 4, 5, vi 2. ${ }^{6}$ Consequently Mathematics (mathematical calculations or reasonings, $\lambda o ́ \gamma o t$ ) can have no moral character, because they have no moral purpose: for they have no (moral or practical) end in view'. (Their end is the intellectual one, truth.) 'But the "Socratic dialogues" have (a moral parpose, and an ethical and practical end), for they treat of such (ethical) subjects'. On this class of works, called collectively 'Socratic dialogues', see Grote, Plato III 469; also Heitz, Verl. Schrift. Ar, die dial. de Arist. pp. 140-144. By 'Socratic dialogues' are meant dialogues on moral philosophy, after the manner of Socrates, and therefore bearing his name, whether (as in Plato and Xenophon) he was an interlocutor, or not ; the compositions of Socrates' friends and followers, the Socratic 'family', Xenophon, Plato, Aeschines, Antisthenes, Phaedo, (Socraticam domum, Hor. Od. I 19. 14, comp. III 21. 9, Socraticis sermonibus madet. Ats Poet. 310. Socraticae chartae, all meaning moral philosophy). On Socrates' philosophical pursuits and studies see Arist. de part. Anim. I 1.44, 642 a 28, Sic. Tusc. Disp. v 5. 10, Academ. Post. I 4. 15. Conf.




 (which it might seem that the 'Socratic dialogues' were in verse. See







Tyrwhitt's note ad oc. p. info. The meaning of that passage is, that the Socratic dialogues are not to be called poetry or verse, although they have a dramatic character (Gräfenhan).
§ 9. 'Another, different, kind of ethical drawing or representation (ain $\lambda a$; no longer confined to moral qualities, but the representation of character in general) are the characteristic peculiarities that accompany each individual character: for instance, "so and so walked on as he was talking"-an indication of audacity and rudeness of character'. The rudeness and insolence are shewn in not stopping to speak to the other; it is a sign of slight esteem and contempt, ìiz $\gamma \boldsymbol{j} i a$. The characters here spoken of differ in one point from the dramatic characters of III 7.6,though they belong to the same family, the third kind of $\ddot{\eta} \eta \eta$, Introd. p. 112-in that these are the characteristic peculiarities of individuals, the others those of classes. A good specimen of this ethical description occurs in Demosth. de F. L. § 361, a portrait of Aeschines; and two




 is 'to keep pace with', 'to walk on a level', 'place oneself on equal terms with' another. See Shilleto ad loci. de F. L. (His reference to the passage of $c$. Steph. should be $\S 63$, not 77 .)
'And again, in speaking, let your words seem to proceed, not from the intellect (as the effect of calculation, deliberation), but as it were from a moral purpose or intention (the will; or, as we should say, the heart)'. "Let your style bear the impress, not so much of intellectual subtlety and vigour, as of good feeling and sound moral purpose : the one may be the mark of a wise man, the other is that of a good-and, what is more to the purpose in Rhetoric, a popular-character." Introd. (slightly altered). '"And I wished this to take place; in fact such was my purpose and intention: it is true that I gained nothing by it; but even so it is better." The one is characteristic of a wise or prudent man, the other of a good one : for prudence (worldly, practical, wisdom) shews itself in the pursuit of one's interest, goodness in that of the fair, high, noble, right'.
'If any (trait of character that you introduce) seem incredible, then add the statement (or explanation) of the cause or reason, as (in) the example that Sophocles gives, the passage of (from) his Antigone "that





$\mu \eta \tau \rho o ̀ s \delta^{\prime}$ Év ớdov каi $\pi \alpha \tau \rho o ̀ s \beta \epsilon \beta \eta \kappa o ́ \tau \omega \nu$,


## $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \nu$

 she cared more for her brother than for husband or children, for the one could be replaced (recovered) if they were lost-but when father and mother are buried in the grave, no brother can spring up evermore"'. This is Antigone's reason for preferring the burial of her brother's body to marriage with Haemon, a husband and children : she has shewn her character in the preference, and the obstinacy in which she adheres to it. It is the conclusion of a beautiful passage, beginning, ※ $\tau i \mu \beta o s, \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu \nu \mu$ -
 $\beta \in \beta \eta \kappa o ́ \tau \omega \nu$.

The same answer is put into the mouth of the wife of Intaphernes, when Darius, having condemned her husband and the whole of his family to death, allows her to choose one of the number whose life is to be spared. She chooses her brother, and when Darius expresses his surprise and demands the reason, replies thus: ' $\Omega$ 及aci


 two passages of the poet and historian, and another equally close correspondence of Herod. II 35 with Soph. Oed. Col. 337, have led to the inference that there was some connexion or acquaintance between the two. When or where they met, if they ever did meet, cannot now be ascertained: Samos (which has been. suggested) is out of the question; for Herodotus was at Thurium before Sophocles was appointed to his command in the expedition under Pericles against that island. The Antigone was produced in 440 B.C. It is probable that some parts of Herodotus' history had been published ${ }^{1}$ before the final completion of the work at Thurium, and Sophocles may have thus obtained access to them. That he was the borrower, there can be no reasonable doubt. At all events that Sophocles was an admirer of Herodotus we know from Plutarch, who gives us the first line and a half of an epigram by Sophocles


'If you have no reason to give, at any rate you may say that ". you know that what you say will convince nobody, but such is your nature (you can't help being virtuous and disinterested, do what you will)-for
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 people never believe in disinterested motives ${ }^{11}$. (Lit. people always disbelieve that any one does anything intentionally except what is for his own interest.) Even such a reason is better than none at all.
$\S$ 10. 'Further, besides the $\bar{\eta} \theta o s$, topics may be also derived from the expression of emotion of various kinds, by introducing in your naration both the usual accompaniments of these emotions (the outward expressions, attitudes, and other external indications), which everybody is acquainted with, and also any special peculiarities by which you yourself or the adversary may be distinguished (which may be attached to, belong to, $\pi \rho o \sigma o ́ v r a)$ '. These special touches and traits in the expression of individual emotion will lend a lifelike character to the descriptions of your narrative, and impart fidelity to your own impersonations of feelings, and your representation of them as they manifest themselves in others. How true and lifelike all that is, the audience will say: that can be no counterfeit: the man is evidently in earnest. Again, the same popular fallacy as before; the illicit inference from the faithfulness of the imitation to the sincerity of the feeling and truth of the fact.

'Such indications are "and he went away with a scowl at me from under his eyebrows" (so tavp $\begin{aligned} & \delta o ̀ \nu ~ v i ́ m o \beta \lambda e ́ q u s ~ o f ~ ' a n ~ a n g r y ~ g l a n c e ', ~ P l . ~\end{aligned}$ Phaed. 117 B; three other examples in Act's Lex., where it is joined in the


 of Cratylus "furiously hissing and shaking his fists"' (סtá in both participles is intensive, 'thorough, thoroughly'; here 'violently': Aeschines and Cratylus are supposed by Victorius to be, the one Socrates' intimate, the other Plato's instructor in the Heraclitean philosophy, and the Eponymus of one of his dialogues: but nobody really knows): 'these are persuasive, because these things (indications of passion) which they do know are made (by the speaker) signs or tokens of those that they don't know (in the manner above explained). A great number of these (indications of
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feeling) may be obtained from Homer: "Thus then he spake; and the aged dame (Euryclea, Ulysses' old nurse) held fast (clasped) her face with her hands" (Hom. Od. $\tau^{\prime}$ [XIX] 361)-for people, when they are beginning to cry, are apt to lay hold of their eyes. Introduce yourself at once (to the audience) in a particular character (in that, namely, which you wish to bear in their eyes) that they may regard you as such: and the adversary in the same way (mutatis mutandis): only take care that the design isn't detected. That there is no difficulty in this-in conveying these impressions to the audience, how readily they seize, and draw inferences from, these indications of emotion, expression of features, action and the like-must needs be seen' (retaining $\delta \in i ́ \imath$ with Bekker, Spengel omits it) 'from the case of messengers : of things that we know nothing whatever about, we nevertheless (instantly) conceive a notion or suspicion' (from the face, expression, gestures, general appearance of the messenger ; as if he is hot and tired, and so on).

See what a ready tongue suspicion hath! He that but fears the thing he would not know, hath by instinct knowledge from others' eyes, that what he feared is chanced. Northumb. Henry IV. Act I, Sc. I, 84 . Victorius refers to Soph. Trach. 869 (Dind.) as an instance of this, the suspicions of the Chorus gathered from the old woman's face.
'The narrative should be (not confined to one place and continuous, but) distributed over the speech ( $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda a \alpha^{\prime} 0 \hat{v}$ 'in many places'), and sometimes not at the beginning'. In saying oủk ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \boldsymbol{\nu} \dot{\alpha} \rho \times \hat{\eta}$, Ar. is referring to his own division of the speech, which excludes the $\pi \rho o o i \mu \iota o \nu$ and commences at once with the $\pi \rho \rho_{0} \theta \sigma \sigma s, c$. 13. The narrative, he says, should sometimes even be entirely out of its proper place, which is at the beginning.
§ ir. 'In public speaking there is least occasion for narrative, because no one ever gives a narrative of things future' (the only pro| vince of deliberative Rhetoric, from which all its materials are derived; $\omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$ ënos cinciv): 'but if there be a narrative, it must be of things past, in order that with these in their recollection they may be better able to deliberate about things to come'. Gaisford refers to Dionys. Ars Rhet.

 ßovえevtéov.
' Or it may be employed in the way of accusation or of praise', $\delta \iota \eta-$








 function of the adviser' (whose office is to exhort and dissuade).

The following sentence to the end of the chapter I have done what I can to elucidate in the Introd. p. 354. No commentator, except Victorius, whose explanation I have there criticized, has bestowed a single word upon it ; not even Spengel in his recent edition: I suppose he has given it up as hopeless. What it seems to me to mean is something of this kind-but I think there is most likely some latent corruption. 'If there be anything incredible in your narrative, you may promise your audience (omit re) to add ${ }^{1}$ a reason (i. e. explanation, to account for it), and a full, detailed, explanation of it as long as they please'. סıarártєt is one of the chief difficulties of the passage. The only appropriate meaning that occurs to me is to 'set out in order, i. e. set forth in full and clear detail': ois $\beta$ oúdourat 'with what, with as many details as, they please'. 'As Carcinus' Jocasta, in his Oedipus, is perpetually promising, in answer to the inquiries of the man who is looking for her son-(something or other, which is left to be supplied by the hearer's knowledge of the context : probably, to satisfy him). And Sophocles' Haemon'. This last example must be given up as hopeless: there is nothing in the extant play which could be interpreted as is required here. And what Carcinus' Jocasta has to do with the topic to be illustrated, is not easy to see. Carcinus' Medea has been already quoted II 23.28, where an account is given of him in the note. His Thyestes is referred to, Poet. XVI 2, and a fault pointed out, XVII 2. And as if to aggravate the difficulties which surround the interpretation of this passage, Wagner, in his collection of the Tragic Fragments, has chosen to omit this reference to Carcinus.

## CHAP. XVII.

Of the various kinds of proof, the various ways in which facts and statements may be made to appear probable, $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon t s$, some are direct and logical, and appeal exclusively to the reasoning faculty; others indirect, which by appealing to the moral sense $\dot{\eta} \theta o s$, or to the emotions $\pi a^{\prime} \theta_{o s}$, support the logical arguments by the favourable impressions they- produce upon the hearts and feelings of the listeners, who are ever ready to

[^22]






 draw inferences from what they feel to the truth of what is said; and further the adventitious and external aids, which are not invented by the speaker but found ready for use and applied by him in evidence of the facts of his case : of these three the first only have any pretension to the character of ajodecktıкai. But not even these are entitled to the name in its strict and proper sense, $\dot{a} \pi \mathbf{j o ́}_{\boldsymbol{\delta} \epsilon \iota \xi \iota s}$ 'demonstration' implying conclusions universal and necessary and a rigorous exact syllogistic method. This belongs, strictly speaking, exclusively to the domain of Science and to the sphere of certainty, to which no conclusion of Rhetoric can ever attain. When it is said therefore in § 1 , that "the proofs of preceding statements, and refutation of those of the adversary"-which from the third division of the speech-"must be demonstrative",-no more is meant than that they must be demonstrated, so far as the nature and limits of rhetorical proof permit, that is, that they must be such, so far consistent with sound reasoning and the rules of logic, as will induce those who hear them to believe what they seek to establish. We have very frequently had to remark the language of strict Logic applied to the laxer methods of Rhetoric, here it is done a little more formally than |usual.
'The point to which this proof must be directed (addressed) of the four questions on which the issue may turn, is the particular point on which the issue is actually joined between the two contending parties: for example, if the issue is the question of fact, was the thing done or not? in the trial this is the point that he must most aim at establishing; if of harm or loss, injury, at that; or if-these two being admitted-the question is one of the degree or amount of the injury; or of the justice of the action-admitting the fact and the injury and even the amount charged-of that ; just as much (in the three last cases) as if the issue had been one of that same thing as a fact'. Spalding, ad Quint. III 6.60,
 ópıки́, or status finitivus.
§ 2. 'But let it not be forgotten that this issue (of fact) is the only one in which it may happen that one of the two parties must necessarily be a rogue: for in such cases, ignorance (which exempts from responsibility, see note on c. 15.3) cannot be pleaded (cannot be assigned as the cause or reason), as it may when the issue is the justice (or injustice) of the act'-and the same of the injury, and alleged degree or amount of the offence-' and therefore in this issue alone the topic may be dwelt







 upon, but not in the (three) others'. It is important to observe here a qualification of the apparent meaning, which has not been-at all events distinctly-pointed out by the Commentators. It would not be true to say universally that when the issue is that of fact, whether the act alleged has or has not been committed, that one of the two parties concerned must necessarily be a rogue: as when A accuses B of murder, the question is one of fact, is $B$ guilty or not guilty? $B$ may be perfectly innocent, though the circumstantial evidence is so strong as to justify $\mathbf{A}$ in bringing the charge. All that is meant is, that there is a certain class of cases which fall under this status or issue, in which this topic may be safely used. Comp. Eth. Nic. V io, 1135 b 30 , ẅनnep è̀ roís $\sigma v \nu a \lambda \lambda a ́ y-$
 $a ̈ \nu \mu \eta ̀ \delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta \nu$ avirò $\delta \rho \omega \hat{\sigma} \iota \nu$. This is the case of a deposit, which A seeks to recover from $B$, who denies having received it. Here-unless either of them has forgotten the transaction-either $A$, if he seeks to recover what he knows that he has never confided, or B , if he refuses to restore what he knows has been lent him, must intend to defraud the other (Schrader). This is repeated from Introd. p. 356, note.
ms $\mathrm{A}^{0}$ (Bekker) has xpךoréov, which has not been adopted either by Bekker or Spengel. The Schol., quoted by Gaisford Not. Var., manifestly reads $\chi$ р $\eta \sigma$ тéon.
§ 3. 'In the epideictic branch, in its ordinary topic, amplification is mostly employed in shewing that things are fair (fine) or useful'the other, $\mu$ eiwots, 'detraction' employed in censure, is omitted as less usual-'the facts must be taken on trust: declaimers seldom adduce proofs of these; only when they seem incredible, or some one else has got the credit of them (been charged with them; made responsible for them)'. Bekker and Spengel have both adopted ä̀ $\lambda \lambda \omega s$ without manuscript authority, from a conjecture of the former in his 4 to ed. I think they must have overlooked the natural interpretation of ä $\lambda \lambda$ os given in the translation. $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \in \dot{v} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ belongs to the family of irregular passives, of which an account, and a list, are given in Appendix (B) [Vol. I p. 297].
§ 4. 'In public, deliberative, speaking (the four forensic issues may be applied to its special subjects), it may be contended (against an opponent), ( I ) that the future facts alleged will not be (i. e. that the consequences which are assumed to result from the policy recommended will not take place); or admitting that, (2) that it will be unjust ; or (3) inexpedient ; or (4) that the amount and importance of them will not be so








 great as the other anticipates. (The principal attention of the speaker is of course to be directed to the point immediately in question,) but he must also be on the look out for any lurking fallacy or misstatement outside the main point or issue: for the one may be shewn necessarily to imply the other'. Te $\mu \eta^{\prime} \rho \iota o \nu$, a necessary sign, or indication, 1 2. 17. The

§ 5. 'Examples are most appropriate to public speaking, enthymemes more so to forensic'. Pleading gives more occasion to the employment of logical reasoning; it admits of closer and subtler argumenration; for the reasons stated in III 12.5. Comp. I 9.40, where the facts are the same, but the reason assigned for the latter different.
'For the one', (understand $\delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma o \rho i a$, from $\delta \eta \mu \eta \gamma o \rho ı \kappa \omega ́ t a r a . ~ V i c t o r i u s ~$ understands $\sigma v \mu \beta o v \lambda \dot{\eta}$, and Dater $\pi i \sigma \tau \tau s$, ) 'dealing as it does with the future, is forced consequently to derive examples from past events (from which the analogous events future are inferred), whilst the other' (understand in like
 fact, true or false, which admit to a greater extent (than deliberative speaking) of demonstrative reason and necessary conclusions (not to the full extent, which is found only in science) : for past facts involve a kind of necessity'. Past events are beyond recall, fixed and definite, and thus have $a$. sort of necessary character about them; and they can be argued about, and their relations deduced, with some approach to certainty: about things future no exact calculation is possible, anticipation and inference from the past is all that nature allows: uncertainty is the chapracteristic of the future.
§ 6. 'The enthymemes, or argumentative inferences, should not be all brought forward one after another, in a continuous connected series, but mixed $u p$ ( $\dot{d} v \dot{a}$ ) with other topics: otherwise they injure one another by destroying (kará) the effect ${ }^{1}$. (And this is not all,) for there is also a
${ }^{1}$ This is, "to relieve the weariness, and assist the intelligence of the uncultivated audience. A long and connected chain of arguments not only puzzles and confounds a listener unaccustomed to continuous reasoning, but also wearies and overwhelms him: so that, one argument coming upon another before he has perceived the force of the preceding, they clash together, come into conflict, as it were, and the force and effect of the whole is weakened or destroyed. Comp. 12. 12, 13 , 11 22. 3, ali bi." From Introd. p. 357.











limit of quantity; (as Homer says, Od. Iv 204, Menelaus to Nestorides Pisistratos,) "Dear boy, seeing that thou hast said as much as a prudent
 shewing thereby that it is the quantity and not the quality of the words that he had in view.
§ 7. '(Another topic is) not to look for arguments about every thing (see again II 22.3): otherwise, you will do like some philosophers, who draw conclusions better known and more to be trusted (easier to believe, more self-evident or evident at first sight) than the premisses from which they deduce them. Quint. v 12.8, Nec tamen omnibus semper quae invenerimus argumentis onerandus est iudex: quia et taedium afferunt et fidem detrahunt... In rebus vero apertis argumentari tam sit stultum quam in clarissimum solem mortale lumen (a lamp, or other artificial light, made by human agency) inferre.
§ 8. 'Also, when you are trying to excite emotion (appealing to the feelings) use no logical argument: for either it will knock out (drive out, expel) the emotion, or (the emotion will get the better of it and) the argument will have been stated in vain: all simultaneous motions mutually drive out one another, and are either obliterated altogether (by the coexistence) or (the less powerful) is (still further) weakened'; overpowered







 àтобкıásє九 каĭ oío é̀ катака入ı́ $\psi \in \iota$ т треєí. Twining ad Poet. p. 424, note 227.
' Nor again, when you would give the specch an ethical cast, should there be any attempt to combine enthymeme with it; for proof has no









moral character nor moral purpose'. When the hearer's mind, says Schrader (in substance), is occupied with the impression of the moral and intellectual good qualities which the speaker is endeavouring to convey to them, of his intelligence and good intentions, he has neither time nor inclination to attend to the proof of anything else.
§ 9. 'Still, general maxims are to be employed both in narrative and in proof, by reason of the ethical character which belongs to them'. (See II 21. 16, III 16.8.) This is illustrated by a $\gamma \nu \omega \dot{\mu} \eta$ that "it is folly to trust" any one, in the instance of a deposit which has not been returned (Victorius). The maxim is expressed by Epicharmus in the well-known
 Polybius, Dio Chrysostom, and Vic. ad Att. I 19. 6. Müller, Fragm. Phil. Gr. p. 144. Epicharm. Fr. 255.
'And I have given it, and that, knowing all the while "that trust
 here appealed to), (express it thus) " And I don't regret it, though I have been wronged: for he (the opponent) it is true has the advantage in profit, but $I$ in justice" '. Compare the first example in c. 16.9.
§ 10. '(Here again, as in general) public speaking is more difficult than pleading (see II. IO); and naturally ${ }^{1}$ [so, because it is concerned with the future.]
[On the 'times' with which the three classes of speeches, $\lambda$ of yo


$\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \in \hat{i} \delta \dot{\delta}-\dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\eta} \hat{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu \delta \dot{\delta}]$ 'whereas in the former case (forensic oratory) the speaker is concerned with the past, which, as Epimenides the Cretan said, is already known even to diviners; for he himself was not in the habit of divining the future, but only (interpreting) the obscurities of the past.'
kail roîs $\mu \dot{\mu} \nu \tau \epsilon \sigma \nu \nu]$ as has been noticed elsewhere, "was doubtless meant by Epimenides as a sarcasm upon his prophetic brethren, who pretended to see into futurity. 'Even diviners', said he, 'impostors as they are, can prophesy what is past'". Untrod. p. 358, note.

[^23]






The statement that Epimenides specially devoted himself as a soothsayer to solving the riddles of the past, is exemplified by his being invited by the Athenians to advise them as to the purification of the city from the pestilence which arose in consequence of the crime of Cylon (Plutarch, reipubl. ger. pr. 27, Pausanias, 1 14.4, Diogenes Laert. 1 10: Grote, H. G. chap. x sub finein). Plato, who calls him a $\theta \in i o s$ àv' $\rho$, speaks of his foretelling the future (Legg. 642 D ), and the very gift which in the text he appears to disclaim is similarly ascribed to him by Cicero, who after saying est enim ars in iis qui novas res coniectura persequuntur, veteres observatione didicerunt, classes Epimenides among those who are destitute of this art ; qui non ratione aut coniectura, observatis ac notatis signis, sed concitatione quadam animi, aut soluto liberoque motu, futura praesentiunt (de divin. 1 18. 34). But the office of the prophet, or intermediary interpreter between God and man, was not necessarily confined to the prediction of the future, but also included the expounding of the will of heaven respecting the present and the past. Spengel observes: "dicit '́pavтєv́eтo, non é $\mu a \nu-$ тє́̇бaro, i.e. plerumque, non semper."
 supplies a subject ; and when you once have your starting-point, it is easier to find your proof'.
'And it (namely, public speaking) does not admit of many digressions, such as references to one's opponent or to oneself; or again,



By diarpısai are meant 'landing-places', where the speaker may pause and linger for a while, and whence he may even expatiate into a passing digression. This use of the word, which is not noticed in Liddell and Scott, is defined in Ernesti's Lex. Techn. Gr. as commoratio, excursio et quoddam ìnecoódıov, quo orator subinde utitur, ornatus atque





 égovaía.
$\dot{a} \lambda \lambda$ ' $\left.\tilde{\eta}_{\kappa \iota \sigma} \kappa a-i \xi i \sigma \tau \eta r a t\right]$ ' On the contrary, there is less room (for digression) in this than in either of the other branches of Rhetoric, unless the speaker quits his proper subject'. With ' 'jiorntal, compare supra 14. I, èày ékromíap.







 absent from Athens while writing the Rhetoric; here and elsewhere he simply uses the phrase which would be most intelligible to his readers, whether at a distance from Athens or not. Poet. v 6, 144967 , т $\bar{\omega} \nu$



iv $\tau \hat{\Phi} \pi a \nu \eta \gamma \nu \rho \iota \kappa \hat{\varphi}]$ The Panegyric of Isocrates is strictly speaking a $\lambda^{\prime}$ os $\sigma v \mu \beta o v \lambda \epsilon u t<k o ́ s$, as its ostensible object is to advise Athens and Sparta to unite their forces against Persia, under the lead of the former state, but incidentally it becomes a $\lambda_{\text {óyos énıঠéckrıkós, in so far as it }}$ eulogizes the public services of Athens ( $\$ \$ 21-98$ ), while it also digresses
 of Sparta and her partisans ( $\$ 110-114$ ).
iv $\tau \hat{\varphi} \sigma v \mu \mu a \chi \iota \kappa \hat{\varphi}]$ By this is meant the pamphlet generally known as Isocratis de Pace, where the policy of the Athenian general Chares in the conduct of the Social war is criticised, though his name is not men-


§ 11. ' In speeches of display you must introduce laudation into your speech by way of episode, as Isocrates does; for he is always bringing in some character'. The reference to Isocr. is explained by his laudatory episode on Theseus in the Helen §§ 22-38; on Agamemnon in the Panathenaicus $\S \S 72-84$; and on Timotheus in the àviסoots § 107 seq. Spengel, who gives the first two references, also cites some less striking instances, the episode on Paris in Hel. §§ $4 \mathrm{I}-48$, on Pythagoras and the Egyptian priests in Busiris $\S \S 21-29$, and on poets ib. §§ 38-40. Comp. Dionys. Halic. de Isocr. Iud. c. 4, where, among the points in which Isocrates appears superior to Lysias, special mention
 énctoodíots.


 àvouoiots énєєซo8io七s. Quintile. III 9. 4, egressio vert vel...excessus, sive est extra causam, non potest esse pars causae; sive est in causal, adiutorium vel ornamentum partium est carom ex quibus egreditur.
' And this is what Gorgias meant when he remarked that he was never at a loss for something to say; for if (for instance) he speaks of

## PHTOPIKHE 「 17 §§ II, 12.







Achilles, he (naturally) praises Peleus, next Aeacus, then Zeus himself (the father of Aeacus); and similarly valour also (the special virtue of Achilles), and so and so (so ad infinitum); and this is just what I have been describing'.

From this passage of Gorgias the existence of a panegyric oration 'in praise of Achilles', is inferred by Dr Thompson (on p. 178 of his ed. of the Gorgias), who also suggests that "a fragment preserved by the Scholiast on Iliad iv 450 may have belonged to this speech:


The unfailing resource of complimentary episodes on which Gorgias appears to have prided himself, may be paralleled by Pindar's favourite device of leading up by easy transitions to the praises of the Aeacidae
 by the artifice adopted by the rhetorician Lycophron, de Soph. El. 15, 174 bio, as explained by Alexander Aphrodisiensis :-" the sophist Lycophron, when he was compelled by some persons to write an encomium upon the lyre, and found that he hadn't very much to say about it, first very briefly touched upon the praises of the sensible lyre, which we have here on earth, and then mounted up to that in heaven,...the constellation called the Lyre, upon which he composed a long and beautiful and excellent discourse" (from Cope's translation in journal of Classical and Sacred Philology, Vol. 11, No. v, p. 141).
jj rad kail rad noteí] In Vol. mil, No. vil, p. 75 of the Journal above mentioned, Mr Cope has the following note: "The sentence hangs so ill together, and the $\bar{j}$ has so little meaning, that I think we ought to change it into the relative pronoun $\eta$ : and then the sentence will run 'and in like manner valour, which performs such and such feats,' ie. he first praises valour generally, and then proceeds to enumerate different acts of prowess; which may be multiplied ad infinitum." This suggestion, it may be remarked, harmonizes fairly with the reading of MS A ${ }^{\circ} \hat{\eta}+\grave{\alpha}$ kail ra rofeî $\hat{\eta}$ (not $\hat{o}$ ) rotódóe écriv. It has been anticipated by Poss (de Georgia
 тоồ yé ai attu.


§ 12. 'If you have proofs to produce, you may express yourself both in the ethical style, and in that of proof besides; but if you are at.a loss for enthymemes, then in the ethical style alone. In fact, it better befits a man of worth to appear in his true character than that his speech be elaborately reasoned'. The change of subject in the last clause would













§ 13. 'Of enthymemes, those that refute are more popular than those that prove; because a syllogistic conclusion is more clearly drawn (thereby); for opposites are more readily recognised when set beside one another'.



 opponent's conclusion with a counter-syllogism drawing a conclusion contray to that of the opponent, while the évoracts checks the opponent's argument at an early point by attacking one of his premisses (see Introd. pp. 264, 5).
§ 14. 'The refutation of your opponent is not a distinct division of the speech; on the contrary, it is part of the proofs to refute the opponent's positions either by contrary proposition or by counter-syllogism' (i.e. by ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \lambda \in \gamma \chi \sigma$ ).

Quint. III 9. 5, Tamer nee his assentior, quid detrahunt refutationem, tanquam probation subiectam, ut Aristoteles, haec nim est quale constrthat, ill quae destruat.
' Now both in public deliberation and in forensic pleading it is necessary, when you are the opening speaker, to state your own proofs first, and then to meet the arguments on the other side, by direct refutation and by pulling them to pieces beforehand.'

For ảmavrầ, comp. Apsines Rhet. $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\lambda} \lambda \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ c. 7 (Spengel's Rhet.








'But if there is much variety in the opposition, you should begin with the points opposed to you'. For nodíxovs (manifold, complex, diversified,











 it is combined with $\pi о \lambda \nu \mu о \rho ф о \tau \dot{f} \rho a$.

On Callistratus, see note on I 7. 13. The reference is probably to the embassy on which Callistratus was sent into the Peloponnesus, shortly
 hardly mean anything else than 'the public assembly of the Messenians', and not 'the assembly held (at Athens) respecting the Messenians', (which last appears to be the view of Sauppe, Or. Att. II 218, note I; A. Schaefer, Dem. und seine Zeit I p. 113, rightly understands it die Volksgemeinde der Messenier). It was on this embassy that Epaminondas, cum in conventum venisset Arcadum petens ut societatem cum Thebanis et Argivis facerent, was confronted by Callistratus, Atheniensium legatus qui eloquentia omnes eo praestabat tempore, who urged them to ally themselves with Athens (Nepos, Epam. 6, quoted by A. Schaefer).
$\pi \rho o a v \epsilon \lambda \omega \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$.$] i.e. It was not until after he had by anticipation got$ rid of the arguments of his opponents that he stated his own arguments. ovi $\tau \omega$, 'accordingly'; similarly used after the participle $\mu a \chi \in \sigma$ á $\mu \in \nu=\nu$, at the end of the next section.
§ 15. 'When you are speaking in reply, you should first mention the arguments against the statement on the other side, by refuting that statement and drawing up counter-syllogisms, and especially if the arguments on the opposite side are well received; for just as the mind refuses to open itself favourably to one who has been made the victim of prejudice, the same applies to oratory also, if your opponent is held to have made a good speech'.
'You must therefore as it were make room in the hearer's mind for the speech that is about to be made, and this will be effected by getting out of the way your opponent's speech' (with which the minds of your audience are pre-occupied).
'Hence you should establish the credibility of your own case, by first contending either against all or the most important or the most popular or the most easily refuted of the adverse arguments'. As an instance, Aristotle refers to the lines in the Troades of Euripides, beginning with


є่ $\gamma \omega{ }^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} \boldsymbol{\gamma}{ }^{\alpha} \rho{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{H} \rho \alpha \nu$.





969, the first line of Hecuba's lengthy reply to Helen's speech in her


 weakest argument first, an argument which Euripides, like a skilful rhetorician, has placed in the middle of Helen's speech, lines 932-5,
阝арßápшу.
§ 16. 'As regards ethical proof, since there are some things, which, if you say them of yourself, are either invidious or tedious or provoke contradiction, or which, if said of another, involve slander or rudeness, you must ascribe them to some one else instead'.

The reference to the Philippus of Isocrates points (according to Victorius) to p. $96 \mathrm{D} \S \$ 72-78$, where the writer gets rid of the indelicacy of himself reminding Philip of the current imputation that his



 to be open to the objection pointed out by Spengel, that Isocrates can hardly be regarded as putting what are really his own views as a friend of Philip into the mouth of that monarch's enemies ("at vix Isocrates ipse haec animo probans vera putabat"). Spengel accordingly prefers taking it as a reference to $\S \S 4-7$, where, instead of expressing his own satisfaction with one of his compositions, he states that his friends who have heard it recited had been struck by its truthful statement of facts, §4, and had expected that, if published, it would have led to the establishment of peace; it so happened, however, that Philip had concluded peace, before the fastidious rhetorician had elaborated his pamphlet to a sufficient degree to think it deserving of publication. Perhaps a still more appo|site passage, which is omitted by Victorius and Spengel, is that in p. 87 :B, §23, where the writer, after describing himself as deterred by his friends 'ifrom addressing Philip, adds that finally $\epsilon$ ढ̈ $\sigma \pi \epsilon \cup \delta o \nu ~ \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu ~ \eta \dot{\eta} \gamma \omega \dot{\omega} \pi \epsilon \mu \phi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a i$









 eireiv к.r.i. In the course of the passage referred to, the rhetorician makes his imaginary friend compliment him on his writings as ov่ $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \psi \in \omega s \dot{d} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$

 the writer ingeniously placed it in another man's mouth. The device is sufficiently transparent, even if it were not for the candid confession in



The same device, in a less refined form, may be noticed in the modern parallel from Martin Chuszlewit, which will occur to every reader (chap. xxv).
'Apxìoxos $\psi e ́ \gamma \in \epsilon . . . i a ́ \mu \beta \varphi]$ Hor. A. P. 79, Archilochum proprio rabies armavit iambo. Comp. note on 11 23. II. Archilochus (Lycambae spretus infido gener, Epod. vi 13), instead of directly attacking Neobule, the daughter of Lycambes, puts his lampoon into the mouth of her own father, thereby ostensibly refraining from a coarseness of invective, which would imply áypoukia on his own part, but really intensifying its bitterness; as the reader will naturally argue, 'If her own father can say nothing better of her, what will the rest of the world say?' Comp. Bergk, Gr.
 Stobaeus (CX ro, Bergk u.s. p. 552) has preserved nine trochaic lines beginning with the first of the two quotations given by Aristotle, but there is nothing in the passage, so far as there quoted, which illustrates Aristotle's object in here referring to it. There is a rendering of the lines by J. H. Merivale in Wellesley's Anthologia Polyglotta p. 220, beginning Never man again may swear, things shall be as erst they were.
 the first are preserved by Plutarch de tranquill. an. c. 10 (Bergk Gr. Lyr.; p. 541) and are thus rendered by Milman, No care have I of Gyges' golden store, Unenvious I for nought the gods implore; I have no love of wide and kingly sway But turn from pride my reckless eyes away. On Gyges, the wealthy king of Lydia, compare Herod. I 12, rov̂ (sc. Гúyew) кai
 $\mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta$. Archilochus is inveighing against the vice of envy and the vanity of riches, and with a dramatic skill that is one of his characteristics, gives expression to his own feelings by ascribing them to Charon the contented carpenter (comp. Mure, H. G. L. iII 167).

इoфoк入 $\bar{s}$ ] Antig. 688-700, where Haemon quotes the talk of the









town about Creon＇s treatment of Antigone，instead of himself directly


§ 17．＇Further，you should occasionally transform your enthymemes and express them as general maxims＇．Comp．II 2I．I，2，with the notes in Vol．il p．206．On the＇enthymeme＇，see Saint－Hiaire＇s Rhetorique «Aristote，Vol．II pp．345－376；and Jebb＇s Attic Orators，il 289.

Aristotle＇s example of a rowiup seems to be a general reminiscence of a



 gives a reference to Rhet．ad Alex． 2 （3）．32，8eî roùs woûv ëxouras $\mu \dot{\eta} \pi \in \rho-$
 the $\gamma \nu \omega^{\dot{\alpha}} \mu \eta$ in the form of an $i v \theta_{\dot{v} \mu \eta \mu a \text { ，Ar．alters } \delta \quad \delta a \lambda \lambda a y a ̀ s ~ i n t o ~ i t s ~ s y n-~}^{\text {a }}$ onym кaraג入ayai，possibly for no other reason than to avoid the reitera－



## CHAP．XVIII．

This chapter treats of＇Interrogation＇of one＇s opponent（\＄§ I－4）， and of＇Reply＇to his interrogations（ $\$ 5,6$ ）；it concludes with a few remarks on the use of＇ridicule＇，as an accessory to argument．These may be regarded as subdivisions of the general subject of proofs，$\pi$ iorecs， dealt with in the previous chapter，to which the present is an appendix．
＂A favourite instrument of debate with speakers in the public assembly and law－courts is the interrogation of the adversary．The object of this is to enforce an argument ；or to take the adversary by surprise and extract from him an unguarded admission ；or to place him in an awkward dilemma，by shaping your question in such a way that he must either by avowing it admit something which his antagonist wishes to establish，or by refusing seem to give consent by his silence to that which the questioner wishes to insinuate；or to gain some similar advantage．＂Introd．p． 362.

A Greek paraphrase of the first six sections of this chapter，with the



mainly to the rareness of such commentaries on the Rhetoric，was edited in 1838 by Seguer from a MS in the library in Paris，and is reprinted in Spengel＇s Rhetores Graeci 1 pp．163－8，and also in his edition of the Rhetoric，Vol．I pp．147－152．It is a puerile piece of composition， but one or two extracts from it will be given where the writer＇s language really illustrates the text of Aristotle．

On the subject of Interrogatories it may be noticed，that by Athenian Law either party to a suit might put questions to the other， and demand a reply，not only at the preliminary hearing（diváxpotcs） but also at the trial itself（Plato，Apol． 25 D，àmóкpıvar \＆＇＇râé＇кal yàp
 taken down in writing，and produced in court if wanted；in the latter， the questions could only be asked by the party addressing the court， who could not himself be interrupted by any interrogation on the part of his opponent，but only by the enquiries of the jury，which were some－ times even invited by the speaker．（Comp．C．R．Kennedy＇s Demosthenes Iv Appendix vir On Interrogatories）．

Such interrogations，judging from the few specimens that have come down to us，were of the simplest kind；and owing to the large number and the natural impatience of the audience present，（whether as members of the general assembly or of the jury，in cases of the deliberative or the forensic class respectively），anything approaching an elaborate and protracted cross－examination was quite out of the question．

As instances we may quote the following：Isaeus Or．io（ $\pi$ ．rov̂





 ev̉日̇̀s $\lambda$ érect．







 Or． 12 （kar＇＇Eparoo日＇́vous）§ 25，set forth at length in Introd．p．364，note． Spengel also gives a reference to Dem．de Cor．§ 52.

The subject of questioning and replying in sophistical debate is treated by Aristotle himself in the Sophistici Elenchi，esp．c．XV and xvı， （Grote＇s Aristotle II pp．109－115；see also Top．日）．Some of the more striking parallels will be quoted in the course of the commentary．
§ I．＇As to Interrogation，you may＇opportunely resort to it，when your opponent has said the opposite，so that as soon as one more



 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \dot{a} \alpha \nu \pi \rho o ́ \tau \alpha \sigma \iota \nu \mu \grave{\eta} \pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \rho \omega \tau \hat{\alpha} \nu$ тò $\phi \alpha \nu \epsilon \rho o ̀ \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$




 .question is put to him, a contradictory result ensues', i.e. the result is a reductio ad absurdum.

This Topic is exemplified by Pericles' retort to Lampon, the sooth-

 On тe入erí, see note on II 24.2.

The fragment $\pi \in \rho \hat{\text { ép }} \rho \omega+\dot{\eta} \sigma \in \omega s$ (as Spengel points out), besides having


§ 2. 'Or, secondly, (you may employ interrogation) when one point is self-evident, and it is clear that the person interrogated will grant you the other as soon as you put the question. For, when you have obtained your first premiss by asking your opponent to admit it, you must not proceed to put what is self-evident in the form of a question, but simply state the conclusion yourself'. Soph. El. 15, 174 b 38,




The illustration is taken from the Apologia of Socrates. 'Socrates, when accused by Meletus of denying the existence of the gods, asked (vulg. lect. said), if there was anything which he called divine, and on his admitting this, he enquired whether the divine beings (oaíдоиєs) were not either children of the gods or of godlike nature, and on his answering "Yes", "Is there any one" he said "who believes in the existence of the children of the gods and yet denies that of the gods themselves?" This corresponds only partially to the well-known passage in Plat. Apol. p. 27, already commented on in the note on II 23.8. There is probably


 Aristotelis repugnat, neque $\epsilon \ddot{\prime \prime} \rho \eta \kappa \in \nu \in l$ significat : quaesivit ex Meleto num
 rı $\lambda$ éroc." After quoting part of the passage of Plato, he says in conclusion, "Vides Socratem id quod Meletus dixit, non interrogare, sed affirmare."







 $\sigma v \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi \epsilon \iota \nu \delta \epsilon i$.
§ 3．＇Further，（interrogation is appropriate）when the speaker is in－ ending to shew up his opponent either in a self－contradiction or a paradox＇．
§ 4．＇Fourthly，when it is impossible（for the opponent）to meet the question，without giving a sophistical answer＇．For the examples of this
 proper way for the respondent to deal with questions involving equivoca－ tion of terms or amphiboly of propositions is to answer them，at the

 （Grote＇s Ar．II 114），where the interrogation is characterized as sophisti－ cal，while here the same invidious epithet is applied to the answer．

 subtle distinction drawn by the over－intelligent servant in reply to the enquiry whether his master Euripides was at home；Ar．Ach．396，

$\left.\theta_{o \rho v} \beta_{0} \hat{\sigma} \cdot \nu\right]$ This is a neutral word，and may be used of expressions of either pleasure or displeasure on the part of the audience，any＇sensa－ tion＇in fact，whether breaking out into applause or the reverse（see Riddell＇s note on its application to 8ıka⿱宀八九i，Introd．to Plato＇s Apology，
 à $\pi \circ \lambda о \gamma o v \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu$ ．It is used of disapprobation（as here）in Rhet．ad Alex． 18 （19）．3，6，7， 8.
©s ánopoìvtes］It is not the audience that is perplexed；on the con－ trary it has a perfectly clear opinion on the obviously shuffling character of the answer，and expresses its displeasure accordingly，It is the person who gives a＇sophistical＇answer，who is apparently perplexed； hence we should accept the correction $\omega \dot{s}$ àmopồvros proposed by Spengel and Schneidewin．The Paris mS $\mathrm{A}^{\circ}$ actually has àmopoûvras，which sug－ gested to Spengel the alternative emendation àmopoîvta．Similarly the


＇But otherwise＇（i．e．except under the above limitations），＇the speaker must not attempt interrogation；for if his opponent should interpose an objection，the questioner is considered beaten＇．ivar $\bar{\eta}$ is here used of giving a check by interposing an＇instance＇or ëvaraats．See Introd．p． 269.
örı $\mu a ́ \lambda ı \sigma \tau a ~ \sigma v \sigma \tau \rho e ́ \phi e \iota \nu] ~ ' t o ~ p a c k ~ i n t o ~ a s ~ s m a l l ~ a ~ c o m p a s s ~ a s ~ p o s s i b l e ' . ~$.




 pospor:



$\dot{\alpha} \times \rho \beta \beta \hat{\eta}$. Stengel asks with some reason, "Hone nexus flagitat $\chi$ р $\quad$ бrò̀


§ 13. 'Of enthymemes, those that refute are more popular than those that prove; because a syllogistic conclusion is more clearly drawn (thereby); for opposites are more readily recognised when set beside one another'.



 opponent's conclusion with a counter-syllogism drawing a conclusion contray to that of the opponent, while the Ïvoraats checks the opponent's argument at an early point by attacking one of his premisses (see Introd. pp. 264, 5).
§ 14. 'The refutation of your opponent is not a distinct division of the speech; on the contrary, it is part of the proofs to refute the opponent's positions either by contrary proposition or by counter-syllogism' (ie. by ${ }^{\text {en }}$ eq $\chi o s$ ).

Quint. III 9. 5, Tamed nee his assentior, quid detrahunt refutationem, tanquam probation subiectam, ut Aristoteles, haec enim est quae constithat, ill quad destruat.
' Now both in public deliberation and in forensic pleading it is necessary, when you are the opening speaker, to state your own proofs first, and then to meet the arguments on the other side, by direct refutation and by pulling them to pieces beforehand.'

For àmavtầ, comp. Apsines Rhet. $\pi$ kepi $\lambda$ víreas c. 7 (Spengel's Rhet.



For rposiacípovta ('cutting up by anticipation') comp. Rhet. ad Alex.





${ }^{\circ}$ But if there is much variety in the opposition, you should begin with the points opposed to you'. For modíxous (manifold, complex, diversified,











 it is combined with $\pi$ oגv $\mu$ орфorípa.

On Callistratus, see note on I 7. 13. The reference is probably to the embassy on which Callistratus was sent into the Peloponnesus, shortly
 hardly mean anything else than 'the public assembly of the Messenians', and not 'the assembly held (at Athens) respecting the Messenians', (which last appears to be the view of Sauppe, Or. Att. II 218, note I; A. Schaefer, Dem. und seine Zeit I p. 113, rightly understands it die Volksgemeinde der Messenier). It was on this embassy that Epaminondas, cum in conventum venisset Arcadum petens ut societatem cum Thebanis et Argivis facerent, was confronted by Callistratus, Atheniensium legatus qui eloquentia omnes eo praestabat tempore, who urged them to ally themselves with Athens (Nepos, Epam. 6, quoted by A. Schaefer).
$\pi \rho o a v e \lambda \omega \nu$ к.т. . ] $^{\text {] }}$ i.e. It was not until after he had by anticipation got rid of the arguments of his opponents that he stated his own arguments. oũro, 'accordingly'; similarly used after the participle $\mu a \chi \in \sigma a ́ \mu \in \nu 0 \nu$, at the end of the next section.
§ 15 . 'When you are speaking in reply, you should first mention the arguments against the statement on the other side, by refuting that statement and drawing up counter-syllogisms, and especially if the arguments on the opposite side are well received; for just as the mind refuses to open itself favourably to one who has been made the victim of prejudice, the same applies to oratory also, if your opponent is held to have made a good speech'.
'You must therefore as it were make room in the hearer's mind for the speech that is about to be made, and this will be effected by getting out of the way your opponent's speech' (with which the minds of your audience are pre-occupied).
'Hence you should establish the credibility of your own case, by first contending either against all or the most important or the most popular or the most easily refuted of the adverse arguments'. As an instance, Aristotle refers to the lines in the Troades of Euripides, beginning with







969, the first line of Hecuba's lengthy reply to Helen's speech in her


 weakest argument first, an argument which Euripides, like a skilful rhetorician, has placed in the middle of Helen's speech, lines 932-5,
 ßарßápшу.
§ 16. 'As regards ethical proof, since there are some things, which, if you say them of yourself, are either invidious or tedious or provoke contradition, or which, if said of another, involve slander or rudeness, you must ascribe them to some one else instead'.

The reference to the Philippus of Isocrates points (according to Victorius) to p. $96 \mathrm{D} \S \$ 72-78$, where the writer gets rid of the indelicacy of himself reminding Philip of the current imputation that his



 to be open to the objection pointed out by Spengel, that Isocrates can hardly be regarded as putting what are really his own views as a friend of Philip into the mouth of that monarch's enemies ("at vix Isocrates ipse haec animo probans vera putabat"). Spengel accordingly prefers taking it as a reference to $\$ \S 4-7$, where, instead of expressing his own satisfaction with one of his compositions, he states that his friends who have heard it recited had been struck by its truthful statement of facts, §4, and had expected that, if published, it would have led to the establishment of peace; it so happened, however, that Philip had concluded peace, before the fastidious rhetorician had elaborated his pamphlet to a sufficient degree to think it deserving of publication. Perhaps a still more apposite passage, which is omitted by Victorius and Spengel, is that in p. 87 B, § 23, where the writer, after describing himself as deterred by his friends







 ov̀ $\mu o 九 \tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \omega$.

 cireiv к.r.ג. In the course of the passage referred to, the rhetorician makes his imaginary friend compliment him on his writings as ov่ $\mu \epsilon ́ \mu \psi \epsilon \omega s \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda d \dot{d}$
 open to the imputation of indelicacy ( $\pi \epsilon \rho \dot{i}$ avirov̂ $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \notin \theta o \nu o \nu$ ), had not the writer ingeniously placed it in another man's mouth. The device is sufficiently transparent, even if it were not for the candid confession in



The same device, in a less refined form, may be noticed in the modern parallel from Martin Chuzzlewit, which will occur to every reader (chap. xxv).
 armavit iambo. Comp. note on II 23. II. Archilochus (Lycambae spretus infido gener, Epod. vi 13), instead of directly attacking Neobule, the daughter of Lycambes, puts his lampoon into the mouth of her own father, thereby ostensibly refraining from a coarseness of invective, which would imply d́ypoukia on his own part, but really intensifying its bitterness; as the reader will naturally argue, 'If her own father can say nothing better of her, what will the rest of the world say?' Comp. Bergk, Gr.
 Stobaeus (CX ro, Bergk u.s, p. 552) has preserved nine trochaic lines beginning with the first of the two quotations given by Aristotle, but there is nothing in the passage, so far as there quoted, which illustrates Aristotle's object in here referring to it. There is a rendering of the lines by J. H. Merivale in Wellesley's Anthologia Polyglotta p. 220, beginning Never man again may swear, things shall be as erst they were.
 the first are preserved by Plutarch de tranquill. an. c. 10 (Bergk Gr. Lyr. p. 541) and are thus rendered by Milman, No care have I of Gyges' golden store, Unenvious I for nought the gods implore; I have no love of wide and kingly sway But turn from pride my reckless eyes away. On Gyges, the wealthy king of Lydia, compare Herod. 1 12, roû (sc. Гúyew) каi
 $\mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta \eta$. Archilochus is inveighing against the vice of envy and the vanity of riches, and with a dramatic skill that is one of his characteristics, gives expression to his own feelings by ascribing them to Charon the contented carpenter (comp. Mure, H. G. L. III 167).

Ioфokins] Antig. 688-700, where Haemon quotes the talk of the









town about Creon＇s treatment of Antigone，instead of himself directly


§ 17．＇Further，you should occasionally transform your enthymeme and express them as general maxims＇．Comp．II 21．1，2，with the notes in Vol．II p．206．On the＇enthymeme＇，see Saint－Hilaire＇s Rhetorique dAristote，Vol．II pp．345－376；and Jebb＇s Attic Orators，il 289.

Aristotle＇s example of a $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\alpha} \dot{\mu} \eta$ seems to be a general reminiscence of a






 onym karaג入ayai，possibly for no other reason than to avoid the reitera－
 collocation סeî סıa入入árte $\sigma \theta a \mathrm{a}$ ．

## CHAP．XVIII．

This chapter treats of＇Interrogation＇of one＇s opponent（§§ I－4）， and of＇Reply＇to his interrogations（ $\$ 5,6$ ）；it concludes with a few remarks on the use of＇ridicule＇，as an accessory to argument．These may be regarded as subdivisions of the general subject of proofs，$\pi$ morels， dealt with in the previous chapter，to which the present is an appendix．
＂A favourite instrument of debate with speakers in the public assembly and law－courts is the interrogation of the adversary．The object of this is to enforce an argument ；or to take the adversary by surprise and extract from him an unguarded admission ；or to place him in an awkward dilemma，by shaping your question in such a way that he must either by avowing it admit something which his antagonist wishes to establish，or by refusing seem to give consent by his silence to that which the questioner wishes to insinuate；or to gain some similar advantage．＂Untrod．p． 362.

A Greek paraphrase of the first six sections of this chapter，with the


## 


mainly to the rareness of such commentaries on the Rhetoric, was edited in 1838 by Seguer from a MS in the library in Paris, and is reprinted in Spengel's Rhetores Graeci 1 pp. 163-8, and also in his edition of the Rhetoric, Vol. I pp. 147-152. It is a puerile piece of composition, but one or two extracts from it will be given where the writer's language really illustrates the text of Aristotle.

On the subject of Interrogatories it may be noticed, that by Athenian Law either party to a suit might put questions to the other, and demand a reply, not only at the preliminary hearing (àváxptots) but also at the trial itself (Plato, Apol. 25 D, àmóкpıvac \&' 'ra日é' кail yàp
 taken down in writing, and produced in court if wanted; in the latter, the questions could only be asked by the party addressing the court, who could not himself be interrupted by any interrogation on the part of his opponent, but only by the enquiries of the jury, which were sometimes even invited by the speaker. (Comp. C. R. Kennedy's Demosthenes Iv Appendix vir On Interrogatories).

Such interrogations, judging from the few specimens that have come down to us, were of the simplest kind; and owing to the large number and the natural impatience of the audience present, (whether as members of the general assembly or of the jury, in cases of the deliberative or the forensic class respectively), anything approaching an elaborate and protracted cross-examination was quite out of the question.

As instances we may quote the following: Isaeus Or. 10 ( $\pi$. rov̂





 cì $\theta \dot{v} s \lambda^{\prime}$ '́ect.







 Or. 12 (kar' 'Eparoo日'́vovs) $\$ 25$, set forth at length in Introd. p. 364, note. Spengel also gives a reference to Dem. de Cor. § 52.

The subject of questioning and replying in sophistical debate is treated by Aristotle himself in the Sophistici Elenchi, esp. c. xv and xvi, (Grote's Aristotle II pp. 109-115; see also Top. $\Theta$ ). Some of the more striking parallels will be quoted in the course of the commentary.
§ I. 'As to Interrogation, you may opportunely resort to it, when your opponent has said the opposite, so that as soon as one more









 question is put to him, a contradictory result ensues', i.e. the result is a reductio ad absurdum.

This Topic is exemplified by Pericles' retort to Lampon, the sooth-

 On тe入crí, see note on II 24. 2.

The fragment $\pi \in \rho i$ í $\rho \omega \tau \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ (as Spengel points out), besides having


§ 2. 'Or, secondly, (you may employ interrogation) when one point is self-evident, and it is clear that the person interrogated will grant you the other as soon as you put the question. For, when you have obtained your first premiss by asking your opponent to admit it, you must not proceed to put what is self-evident in the form of a question, but simply state the conclusion yourself'. Soph. El. 15, 174 b 38,




The illustration is taken from the Apologia of Socrates. 'Socrates, when accused by Meletus of denying the existence of the gods, asked (vulg. lect. said), if there was anything which he called divine, and on his admitting this, he enquired whether the divine beings (daimoves) were not either children of the gods or of godlike nature, and on his answering "Yes", "Is there any one" he said "who believes in the existence of the children of the gods and yet denies that of the gods themselves?" This corresponds only partially to the well-known passage in Plat. Apol. p. 27, already commented on in the note on II 23.8. There is probably


 Aristotelis repugnat, neque $\epsilon \ddot{\prime \prime} \eta \kappa \in \nu \in \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ significat : quaesivit ex Meleto num daemonion quid crederet. Sed Meletus de Socrate єйp $\eta \kappa \in \nu$ ais ầ dau $\mu$ óvióv rı $\lambda$ éroo." After quoting part of the passage of Plato, he says in conclusion, "Vides Socratem id quod Meletus dixit, non interrogare, sed affirmare."







 $\sigma v \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi \epsilon \iota \nu \delta \epsilon i$.
§ 3. 'Further, (interrogation is appropriate) when the speaker is intending to shew up his opponent either in a self-contradiction or a paradox'.
§ 4. 'Fourthly, when it is impossible (for the opponent) to meet the question, without giving a sophistical answer'. For the examples of this
 proper way for the respondent to deal with questions involving equivocation of terms or amphiboly of propositions is to answer them, at the

 (Grote's Ar. II 114), where the interrogation is characterized as sophistical, while here the same invidious epithet is applied to the answer.
 тò $8^{\prime}$ dं $\lambda \eta \theta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$. As an instance of a quibbling answer, we may compare the subtle distinction drawn by the over-intelligent servant in reply to the enquiry whether his master Euripides was at home; Ar. Ach. 396,

$\left.\theta_{0 \rho v \beta o v} \quad \iota \nu\right]$ This is a neutral word, and may be used of expressions of either pleasure or displeasure on the part of the audience, any 'sensation' in fact, whether breaking out into applause or the reverse (see Riddell's note on its application to 8ıxaбtaí, Introd. to Plato's Apology,

 18 (19). 3, 6, 7, 8.
©s ámopoùvtєs] It is not the audience that is perplexed; on the contrary it has a perfectly clear opinion on the obviously shuffling character of the answer, and expresses its displeasure accordingly. It is the person who gives a 'sophistical' answer, who is apparently perplexed;
 and Schneidewin. The Paris ms $\mathrm{A}^{\circ}$ actually has $\dot{\alpha} \pi$ ooooùras, which sug. gested to Spengel the alternative emendation àmopồvra. Similarly the


'But otherwise' (i.e. except under the above limitations), 'the speaker must not attempt interrogation; for if his opponent should interpose an objection, the questioner is considered beaten'. ivarin is here used of giving a check by interposing an 'instance' or ềvтa⿱宀ts. See Introd. p. 269.
ö́rı $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a ~ \sigma v \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi \epsilon \iota \nu]$ 'to pack into as small a compass as possible'.







 dxфípoval $\lambda$ ' $\xi$ ıs. The verb is used metaphorically to express conciseness and condensation of style; in its literal meaning it might be applied to any squeezing and compacting process like that (for instance) of making a snowball. Comp. note on II 7. 5, $\sigma v \nu \eta \nu a \gamma \kappa a ́ \sigma \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$.
§ 5. 'In answering, you must meet ambiguous questions by drawing a distinction, and not expressing yourself too concisely'. Top. $\theta 7,156 a$


 d $\pi ⿰ 丿 ㇄$ onpifecos (as Spengel notices) the latter part is paraphrased in such
 - бvvтó $\mu$ os.
'In answering questions that appear to involve you in a contradiction, you must give your explanation immediately in your answer, before your opponent asks the next question or draws his conclusion'. This corresponds to what in the old style of our legal pleading would bave been termed 'confession and avoidance'.
 of which rîs $8 \in \hat{i}$ iporây is mentioned as one of the subjects of the
 47-54). Spengel somewhat questionably remarks: "notandus impera-
 indicare videtur;" (on the perfect imperative, see note on I 11.29). He adds, " neque é $\sigma$ тau, quod deteriores exhibent, placet, praesens expectamus, aut intelligendum potius verbum in hac formula."
§ 6. A second precept for 'answering'. 'When a conclusion is being drawn, if your opponent puts the conclusion in the form of a question, you must add the cause of your conduct'. $\sigma v \mu \pi \epsilon \rho a t \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu$ is a neuter accusative absolute. It is here passive, not middle, though the vetus translatio renders it concludentem, which is contrary to the sense required and to the general use of the verb, which is rarely found in the middle. Spengel even asserts non dicitur media forma, but this assertion (unless



 taken as any other than the middle voice).












 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta$ oûs.



इoфok $\lambda \hat{\eta} s$ ] On this statesman and orator (not the poet), and on the ten $\pi \rho \rho_{\beta} \beta_{o u \lambda t o}$ of whom he was one, see note on 114.3.

єv̉Uvópevos tîs éфopias] 'called to account for his administration of the office of ephor'. The ephors are charged with being liable to venality in
 instance repudiates the charge, and insists that he had not acted on the prompting of bribery, but ' on principle' ( $\gamma \nu \omega^{\prime} \mu \eta$ ).
 neither put a further question after drawing the conclusion nor express the conclusion itself in the form of a question, unless the truth of the facts is superabundantly clear'. Comp. Top. $\Theta 2,154$ a 7, already quoted on § 2.
§ 7 treats very briefly of 'jests', as a useful accessory in debate; Ridiculum acri Fortius et melius magnas plerumque secat res (Hor. Sat. I 10. 14). The subject of ridiculum is treated by Cicero de Oratore, II 58.236 seq., Quintil. VI 3.22-112, haec tota disputatio a Graecis mepi y risum petimus aut e.r nobis aut ex rebus mediis (§ 23). For other references see note on I 11.29.

סeive é $\phi \eta$ Гopyias-ò $\left.\rho \theta \hat{\omega} s \lambda^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \gamma \omega \nu\right]$ 'Gorgias laid it down, and rightly too, that you should confound (spoil the effect of) the seriousness of your opponents by ridicule, and their ridicule by seriousness'. In a Scholium

 dictum of Gorgias is quoted in the following form : (beî) ràs $\sigma \pi o u \not \partial a ̀ s ~ r e ̂ v ~$









town about Creon＇s treatment of Antigone，instead of himself directly


§ 17．＇Further，you should occasionally transform your enthymemes and express them as general maxims＇．Comp．II 21．1，2，with the notes in Vol．II p．206．On the＇enthymeme＇，see Saint－Hilaire＇s Rhetorique d＇Aristote，Vol． 11 pp．345－376；and Jebb＇s Attic Orators，II 289.
－Aristotle＇s example of a $\boldsymbol{y}^{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \dot{\mu} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ seems to be a general reminiscence of a



 gives a reference to Rhet．ad Alex． 2 （3）．32，סcî rov̀s voûע ëxovtas pin $\pi \in \rho \iota-$
 the $\nu \nu \omega \dot{\mu} \eta$ in the form of an $\dot{e} \nu \theta \dot{\nu} \mu \eta \mu a$ ，Ar．alters 8 ia onym kara $\lambda a y a i$, possibly for no other reason than to avoid the reitera－
 collocation סeî 8ta入入árreo mas．

## CHAP．XVIII．

This chapter treats of＇Interrogation＇of one＇s opponent（§§ 1－4）， and of＇Reply＇to his interrogations（ $\S 5,6$ ）；it concludes with a few remarks on the use of＇ridicule＇，as an accessory to argument．These may be regarded as subdivisions of the general subject of proofs，$\pi$ iorets， dealt with in the previous chapter，to which the present is an appendix．
＂A favourite instrument of debate with speakers in the public assembly and law－courts is the interrogation of the adversary．The object of this is to enforce an argument；or to take the adversary by surprise and extract from him an unguarded admission ；or to place him in an awkward dilemma，by shaping your question in such a way that he must either by avowing it admit something which his antagonist wishes to establish，or by refusing seem to give consent by his silence to that which the questioner wishes to insinuate；or to gain some similar advantage．＂Introd．p． 362.

A Greek paraphrase of the first six sections of this chapter，with the


 mainly to the rareness of such commentaries on the Rhetoric, was edited in 1838 by Seguer from a mS in the library in Paris, and is reprinted in Spengel's Rhetores Graeci I pp. 163-8, and also in his edition of the Rhetoric, Vol. I pp. 147-152. It is a puerile piece of composition, but one or two extracts from it will be given where the writer's language really illustrates the text of Aristotle.

On the subject of Interrogatories it may be noticed, that by Athenian Law either party to a suit might put questions to the other, and demand a reply, not only at the preliminary hearing (àváxpıots)
 ó vópos кє入єv́є $\mathfrak{a} \pi о к р i \nu a \sigma \theta a i)$. In the former instance, the answers were taken down in writing, and produced in court if wanted; in the latter, the questions could only be asked by the party addressing the court, who could not himself be interrupted by any interrogation on the part of his opponent, but only by the enquiries of the jury, which were sometimes even invited by the speaker. (Comp. C. R. Kennedy's Demosthenes Iv Appendix vir On Interrogatories).

Such interrogations, judging from the few specimens that have come down to us, were of the simplest kind; and owing to the large number and the natural impatience of the audience present, (whether as members of the general assembly or of the jury, in cases of the deliberative or the forensic class respectively), anything approaching an elaborate and protracted cross-examination was quite out of the question.

As instances we may quote the following: Isaeus Or. io ( $\pi$. rov





 eviقùs $\lambda$ éyetv.







 Or. 12 (kar' 'Eparoof'́vous) § 25, set forth at length in Introd. p. 364, note. Spengel also gives a reference to Dem. de Cor. § 52.

The subject of questioning and replying in sophistical debate is treated by Aristotle himself in the Sophistici Elenchi, esp. c. xv and xvi, (Grote's Aristotle II pp. 109-115; see also Top. $\Theta$ ). Some of the more striking parallels will be quoted in the course of the commentary.
§ I. 'As to Interrogation, you may' opportunely resort to it, when your opponent has said the opposite, so that as soon as one more









 question is put to him, a contradictory result ensues', i.e. the result is a reductio ad absurdum.

This Topic is exemplified by Pericles' retort to Lampon, the sooth-

 On rederí, see note on u1 24. 2.



§ 2. 'Or, secondly, (you may employ interrogation) when one point is self-evident, and it is clear that the person interrogated will grant you the other as soon as you put the question. For, when you have obtained your first premiss by asking your opponent to admit it, you must not proceed to put what is self-evident in the form of a question, but simply state the conclusion yourself'. Soph. El. 15, 174 b 38,




The illustration is taken from the Apologia of Socrates. 'Socrates, when accused by Meletus of denying the existence of the gods, asked (vulg. lect. said), if there was anything which he called divine, and on his admitting this, he enquired whether the divine beings (daipoves) were not either children of the gods or of godlike nature, and on his answering "Yes", "Is there any one" he said "who believes in the existence of the children of the gods and yet denies that of the gods themselves?" This corresponds only partially to the well-known passage in Plat. Apol. p. 27, already commented on in the note on II 23.8. There is probably some corruption in the word eitpqкev where we should expect $\boldsymbol{\eta} \rho \dot{\text { a }}$ or ${\text { п̈pero. Spengel, following } \mathrm{A}^{\circ} \text { and the vetus translatio, reads etippкed }}^{\text {a }}$
 Aristotelis repugnat, neque eípqкev ei significat : quaesivit ex Meleto num daemonion quid crederet. Sed Meletus de Socrate eitppкev ois à̀ daunóvóv rı $\lambda^{\prime}$ you." After quoting part of the passage of Plato, he says in conclusion, " Vides Socratem id quod Meletus dixit, non interrogare, sed affirmare."







 $\sigma v \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi \epsilon \iota \nu \delta \in i$.
§ 3. 'Further, (interrogation is appropriate) when the speaker is intending to shew up his opponent either in a self-contradiction or a paradox'.
§ 4. 'Fourthly, when it is impossible (for the opponent) to meet the question, without giving a sophistical answer'. For the examples of this
 proper way for the respondent to deal with questions involving equivocation of terms or amphiboly of propositions is to answer them, at the

 (Grote's $A r$. II 114), where the interrogation is characterized as sophistical, while here the same invidious epithet is applied to the answer.
 بò $\delta{ }^{\circ}$ a $\lambda \lambda \eta \theta$ és. As an instance of a quibbling answer, we may compare the subtle distinction drawn by the over-intelligent servant in reply to the enquiry whether his master Euripides was at home; Ar. Ach. 396,

$\theta o \rho v \beta o v \sigma \tau \nu]$ This is a neutral word, and may be used of expressions of either pleasure or displeasure on the part of the audience, any 'sensation' in fact, whether breaking out into applause or the reverse (see Riddell's note on its application to dikactaí, Introd. to Plato's Apology,

 18 (19). 3, 6, 7, 8.
ws amopoivres] It is not the audience that is perplexed; on the contrary it has a perfectly clear opinion on the obviously shuffling character of the answer, and expresses its displeasure accordingly. It is the person who gives a 'sophistical' answer, who is apparently perplexed; hence we should accept the correction as ḋzooồvos proposed by Spengel and Schneidewin. The Paris ms $A^{+}$actually has à $\pi$ opoìvtas, which suggested to Spengel the alternative emendation $\dot{\text { a }} \boldsymbol{\pi}$ opoivra. Similarly the


'But otherwise' (i.e. except under the above limitations), 'the speaker must not attempt interrogation; for if his opponent should interpose an objection, the questioner is considered beaten'. ivvaj̀ is here used of giving a check by interposing an 'instance' or ẽvoracıs. See Introd. p. 269.









 érфépovaa $\lambda$ égıs. The verb is used metaphorically to express conciseness and condensation of style; in its literal meaning it might be applied to any squeezing and compacting process like that (for instance) of making a snowball. Comp. note on II 7. 5, бvəךvayкáбAךбav.
§ 5. 'In answering, you must meet ambiguous questions by drawing a distinction, and not expressing yourself too concisely'. Top. Ө 7, 156 a




 - бvvtó $\mu \omega$ s.
'In answering questions that appear to involve you in a contradiction, you must give your explanation immediately in your answer, before your opponent asks the next question or draws his conclusion'. This corresponds to what in the old style of our legal pleading would bave been termed 'confession and avoidance'.
ék rồ тотเкผิ้] namely in Top. lib. viII ( $\theta$ ), in the opening words of which $\pi \hat{\omega} s$ de $\hat{\imath}$ éparầ is mentioned as one of the subjects of the book; $\pi \in \rho \grave{\prime}$ àmoкрívews is treated from c. 4 to c. 10; (Grote's Ar. Vol. II 47-54). Spengel somewhat questionably remarks: "notandus impera-
 indicare videtur;" (on the perfect imperative, see note on I 11.29). He adds, " neque $\begin{gathered}\text { éraut, quod deteriores exhibent, placet, praesens expectamus, }\end{gathered}$ aut intelligendum potius verbum in hac formula."
§ 6. A second precept for 'answering'. 'When a conclusion is being drawn, if your opponent puts the conclusion in the form of a question, you must add the cause of your conduct'. $\sigma v \mu \pi \epsilon \rho a t \nu o \mu e \nu o \nu$ is a neuter accusative absolute. It is here passive, not middle, though the vetus translatio renders it concludentem, which is contrary to the sense required and to the general use of the verb, which is rarely found in the middle. Spengel even asserts non dicitur media forma, but this assertion (unless I misunderstand his meaning) is refuted by Top. H5, $150 a 33$, fậov yàp èv


 taken as any other than the middle voice).








 $\alpha \pi o ́ \lambda o \iota o ; "$ "oủ $\delta \bar{\eta} \tau \alpha "$ є́ $\phi \eta$ " "oĭ $\mu \in ̇ \nu \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \rho \eta{ }^{\prime} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$


 ả $\lambda \eta$ Oous.



इoфok入js] On this statesman and orator (not the poet), and on the ten $\pi \rho \rho^{\prime} \beta_{o v \lambda}$ ot of whom he was one, see note on 114.3.

єंधेvópevos тท̂s é申opias] 'called to account for his administration of the office of ephor'. The ephors are charged with being liable to venality in
 instance repudiates the charge, and insists that he had not acted on the prompting of bribery, but ' on principle' ( $\gamma^{\nu} \propto^{\prime} \mu \eta$ ).
 neither put a further question after drawing the conclusion nor express the conclusion itself in the form of a question, unless the truth of the facts is superabundantly clear'. Comp. Top. © 2, 154 a 7, already quoted on § 2.
$\oint 7$ treats very briefly of 'jests', as a useful accessory in debate $;$ Ridiculum acri Fortius et melius magnas plerumque secat res (Hor. Sat. I 10. 14). The subject of ridiculum is treated by Cicero de Oratore, II 58.236 seq., Quintil. VI 3.22-112, haec tota disputatio a Graecis repl $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{E} \text { doiov inscribitur (§ 22)...usus autem maxime triplex, aut enim ex aliis }}$ risum petimus aut ex nobis aut ex rebus mediis (§ 23). For other references see note on I 11. 29.

סeì è $\phi \eta$ Гopyias-ỏ $\rho \theta \omega ̂ s ~ \lambda e ́ \gamma \omega \nu] ~ ' G o r g i a s ~ l a i d ~ i t ~ d o w n, ~ a n d ~ r i g h t l y ~ t o o, ~$ that you should confound (spoil the effect of) the seriousness of your opponents by ridicule, and their ridicule by seriousness'. In a Scholium on Plat. Gorg. p. 473 E , (where Socrates says to Polus) yelậs ; ä $\lambda \lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ av̉
 dictum of Gorgias is quoted in the following form : ( $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\mathrm{e}} \mathrm{i}$ ) ràs $\sigma \pi$ oudàs rề
 тоィทтє́ò.

## 

 $\dot{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \gamma \omega{ }^{\prime} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho{ }^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \rho \alpha \nu$.





969, the first line of Hecuba's lengthy reply to Helen's speech in her


 weakest argument first, an argument which Euripides, like a skilful rhetorician, has placed in the middle of Helen's speech, lines 932-5,
 $\beta$ ар $\beta$ áp $\omega$.
§ 16. 'As regards ethical proof, since there are some things, which, if you say them of yourself, are either invidious or tedious or provoke contradiction, or which, if said of another, involve slander or rudeness, you must ascribe them to some one else instead'.

The reference to the Philippus of Isocrates points (according to Victorius) to $\mathrm{p} .96 \mathrm{D} \S \mathrm{D}^{2}-78$, where the writer gets rid of the indelicacy of himself reminding Philip of the current imputation that his



 to be open to the objection pointed out by Spengel, that Isocrates can hardly be regarded as putting what are really his own views as a friend of Philip into the mouth of that monarch's enemies ("at vix Isocrates ipse haec animo probans vera putabat"). Spengel accordingly prefers taking it as a reference to $\S \S 4-7$, where, instead of expressing his own satisfaction with one of his compositions, he states that his friends who have heard it recited had been struck by its truthful statement of facts, $\S 4$, and had expected that, if published, it would have led to the establishment of peace; it so happened, however, that Philip had concluded peace, before the fastidious rhetorician had elaborated his pampllet to a sufficient degree to think it deserving of publication. Perhaps a still more apposite passage, which is omitted by Victorius and Spengel, is that in p. 87 B, $\S 23$, where the writer, after describing himself as deterred by his friends from addressing Philip, adds that finally $\ddot{\epsilon} \sigma \pi \epsilon \in \delta o \nu ~ \mu \hat{\lambda} \lambda \lambda o \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \gamma \omega \dot{\omega} \pi \epsilon \mu \phi \theta \tilde{\eta} \nu a i$






 ov' $\mu$ o九 đ̀̀ ${ }^{\prime} \dot{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \omega$.

 cireiv к.r.i. In the course of the passage referred to, the rhetorician makes his imaginary friend compliment him on his writings as ov่ $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \psi \in \omega s \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$
 open to the imputation of indelicacy ( $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{i}$ avirov̂ $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ '่ $\pi i \phi \theta o v o \nu$ ), had not the writer ingeniously placed it in another man's mouth. The device is sufficiently transparent, even if it were not for the candid confession in



The same device, in a less refined form, may be noticed in the modern parallel from Martin Chuzzlewit, which will occur to every reader (chap. xxv).
 armavit iambo. Comp. note on II 23. II. Archilochus (Lycambae spretus infido gener, Epod. vi 13), instead of directly attacking Neobule, the daughter of Lycambes, puts his lampoon into the mouth of her own father, thereby ostensibly refraining from a coarseness of invective, which would imply dंypotkia on his own part, but really intensifying its bitterness; as the reader will naturally argue, 'If her own father can say nothing better of her, what will the rest of the world say?' Comp. Bergk, Gr.
 Stobaeus (CX ro, Bergk u.s. p. 552) has preserved nine trochaic lines beginning with the first of the two quotations given by Aristotle, but there is nothing in the passage, so far as there quoted, which illustrates Aristotle's object in here referring to it. There is a rendering of the lines by J. H. Merivale in Wellesley's Anthologia Polyglotta p. 220, beginning Never man again may swear, things shall be as erst they were.
 the first are preserved by Plutarch de tranquill. an. c. 10 (Bergk Gr. Lyr. p. 54I) and are thus rendered by Milman, No care have I of Gyges' golden store, Unenvious I for nought the gods implore; I have no love of wide and kingly sway But turn from pride my reckless eyes away. On Gyges, the wealthy king of Lydia, compare Herod. i 12, rov̂ (sc. Гúyew) kaì
 $\mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta \eta$. Archilochus is inveighing against the vice of envy and the vanity of riches, and with a dramatic skill that is one of his characteristics, gives expression to his own feelings by ascribing them to Charon the contented carpenter (comp. Mure, H. G. L. III 167).

Eoфokijs] Antig. 688-700, where Haemon quotes the talk of the









town about Creon's treatment of Antigone, instead of himself directly


§ 17. 'Further, you should occasionally transform your enthymeme and express them as general maxims'. Comp. II 21. 1, 2, with the notes in Vol. II p. 206. On the 'enthymeme', see Saint-Hiłaire's Rhetorique n'Aristote, Vol. II pp. 345-376; and Jebb's Attic Orators, II 289.

Aristotle's example of a $\gamma \nu \dot{\mu} \mu \eta$ seems to be a general reminiscence of a





 the $\gamma \nu \dot{\prime} \dot{\mu}$ in the form of an $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta_{\dot{v} \mu \eta \mu a \text {, Ar. alters } \delta \iota a \lambda \lambda a y a ̀ s \text { into its syn- }}$ onym kara $\lambda a y a l$, possibly for no other reason than to avoid the reitera-
 collocation סeî дıа入入áттєб val.

## CHAP. XVIII.

This chapter treats of 'Interrogation' of one's opponent ( $\$ \S(4)$, and of 'Reply' to his interrogations ( $\S 5,6$ ); it concludes with a few remarks on the use of 'ridicule', as an accessory to argument. These may be regarded as subdivisions of the general subject of proofs, aigrets, dealt with in the previous chapter, to which the present is an appendix.
"A favourite instrument of debate with speakers in the public assembly and law-courts is the interrogation of the adversary. The object of this is to enforce an argument ; or to take the adversary by surprise and extract from him an unguarded admission; or to place him in an awkward dilemma, by shaping your question in such a way that he must either by avowing it admit something which his antagonist wishes to establish, or by refusing seem to give consent by his silence to that which the questioner wishes to insinuate; or to gain some similar advantage." Introd. p. 362.

A Greek paraphrase of the first six sections of this chapter, with the


 mainly to the rareness of such commentaries on the Rhetoric，was edited in 1838 by Seguer from a MS in the library in Paris，and is reprinted in Spengel＇s Rhetores Graeci 1 pp．163－8，and also in his edition of the Rhetoric，Vol．I pp．147－152．It is a puerile piece of composition， but one or two extracts from it will be given where the writer＇s language really illustrates the text of Aristotle．

On the subject of Interrogatories it may be noticed，that by Athenian Law either party to a suit might put questions to the other， and demand a reply，not only at the preliminary hearing（diváxpıocs） but also at the trial itself（Plato，Apol． 25 D ，àлóкрıvat \＆＇ra日é＇kai yàp ó vópos кє入évé ḋ̇окрivarAal）．In the former instance，the answers were taken down in writing，and produced in court if wanted；in the latter， the questions could only be asked by the party addressing the court， who could not himself be interrupted by any interrogation on the part of his opponent，but only by the enquiries of the jury，which were some－ times even invited by the speaker．（Comp．C．R．Kennedy＇s Demosthenes Iv Appendix vir On Interrogatories）．

Such interrogations，judging from the few specimens that have come down to us，were of the simplest kind；and owing to the large number and the natural impatience of the audience present，（whether as members of the general assembly or of the jury，in cases of the deliberative or the forensic class respectively），anything approaching an elaborate and protracted cross－examination was quite out of the question．

As instances we may quote the following：Isaeus Or．io（ $\pi$ ．rov̂














 Or． 12 （кат＇＇Eparoo日＇́vous）§ 25，set forth at length in Introd．p．364，note． Spengel also gives a reference to Dem．de Cor．§ 52.

The subject of questioning and replying in sophistical debate is treated by Aristotle himself in the Sophistici Elenchi，esp．c．Xv and xvi， （Grote＇s Aristotle II pp．109－115；see also Top．日）．Some of the more striking parallels will be quoted in the course of the commentary．
§ I．＇As to Interrogation，you may＇opportunely resort to it，when your opponent has said the opposite，so that as soon as one more









 question is put to him, a contradictory result ensues', i.e. the result is a reductio ad absurdum.

This Topic is exemplified by Pericles' retort to Lampon, the sooth-

 On rederí, see note on u1 24. 2.

The fragment $\pi \in \rho \bar{i} \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \operatorname{rin}^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ (as Spengel points out), besides having


§ 2. 'Or, secondly, (you may employ interrogation) when one point is self-evident, and it is clear that the person interrogated will grant you the other as soon as you put the question. For, when you have obtained your first premiss by asking your opponent to admit it, you must not proceed to put what is self-evident in the form of a question, but simply state the conclusion yourself'. Soph. El. 15, 174 b 38,




The illustration is taken from the Apologia of Socrates. 'Socrates, when accused by Meletus of denying the existence of the gods, asked (vulg. lect. said), if there was anything which he called divine, and on his admitting this, he enquired whether the divine beings (ठaiuoves) were not either children of the gods or of godlike nature, and on his answering "Yes", "Is there any one" he said "who believes in the existence of the children of the gods and yet denies that of the gods themselves?" This corresponds only partially to the well-known passage in Plat. Apol. p. 27, already commented on in the note on II 23.8. There is probably some corruption in the word eïprкev where we should expect $\boldsymbol{\eta} \rho \dot{\sigma}$ áa or $\ddot{\eta}^{\boldsymbol{p}}$ ero. Spengel, following $\mathrm{A}^{\bullet}$ and the vetus translatio, reads eippred
 Aristotelis repugnat, neque eip $\quad$ кev el significat : quaesivit ex Meleto num daemonion quid crederet. Sed Meletus de Socrate ē̈p rc $\lambda_{\text {érou." After quoting part of the passage of Plato, he says in con- }}$ clusion, " Vides Socratem id quod Meletus dixit, non interrogare, sed affirmare."






 тои̂ áкроатоv̂．$\delta \iota o ̀ ~ к \alpha i ~ \tau \alpha ́ ~ \epsilon ̇ \nu \theta \nu \mu \eta \prime \mu \alpha \tau \alpha ~ o ̈ \tau \iota ~ \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha ~$ $\sigma \nu \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi \epsilon \iota \nu \delta \epsilon i ̄$.
§ 3．＇Further，（interrogation is appropriate）when the speaker is in－ tending to shew up his opponent either in a self－contradiction or a paradox＇．
§ 4．＇Fourthly，when it is impossible（for the opponent）to meet the question，without giving a sophistical answer＇．For the examples of this
 proper way for the respondent to deal with questions involving equivoca－ tion of terms or amphiboly of propositions is to answer them，at the

 （Grote＇s $A r$ ．II II4），where the interrogation is characterized as sophisti－ cal，while here the same invidious epithet is applied to the answer．

 subtle distinction drawn by the over－intelligent servant in reply to the enquiry whether his master Euripides was at home；Ar．Ach．396，


Oopvßov̂cuv］This is a neutral word，and may be used of expressions of either pleasure or displeasure on the part of the audience，any＇sensa－ tion＇in fact，whether breaking out into applause or the reverse（see Riddell＇s note on its application to 8ıka⿱宀八ai，Introd．to Plato＇s Apology，

 18 （19）．3，6，7， 8.
ws àmopoivtes］It is not the audience that is perplexed；on the con－ trary it has a perfectly clear opinion on the obviously shuffling character of the answer，and expresses its displeasure accordingly．It is the person who gives a＇sophistical＇answer，who is apparently perplexed； hence we should accept the correction is dं $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ opoûvros proposed by Spengel and Schneidewin．The Paris ms $\mathrm{A}^{\circ}$ actually has $\dot{\text { àmopoìras }}$ ，which sug． gested to Spengel the alternative emendation àmopouvra．Similarly the


＇But otherwise＇（i．e．except under the above limitations），＇the speaker must not attempt interrogation；for if his opponent should interpose an objection，the questioner is considered beaten＇．＇ivatỳ is here used of giving a check by interposing an＇instance＇or ëlgraats．See Introd．p． 269.









 iкф'́povara $\lambda$ ésts. The verb is used metaphorically to express conciseness and condensation of style; in its literal meaning it might be applied to any squeezing and compacting process like that (for instance) of making

§ 5. 'In answering, you must meet ambiguous questions by drawing a distinction, and not expressing yourself too concisely'. Top. © 7, $156 a$


 $\dot{\boldsymbol{a} \pi o \kappa p i \sigma e c o s ~(a s ~ S p e n g e l ~ n o t i c e s) ~ t h e ~ l a t t e r ~ p a r t ~ i s ~ p a r a p h r a s e d ~ i n ~ s u c h ~}$ a manner as to shew that the writer read daapoûra $\lambda$ órye (omitting кai $\mu$ そ̀) - бvvió $\mu \omega$ s.
'In answering questions that appear to involve you in a contradiction, you must give your explanation immediately in your answer, before your opponent asks the next question or draws his conclusion'. This corresponds to what in the old style of our legal pleading would bave been termed 'confession and avoidance'.


 47-54). Spengel somewhat questionably remarks : "notandus imperativus $\tilde{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \omega$, hoc enim ut $\epsilon \rho \dot{\rho} \dot{j} \theta \omega$, librum illum nondum compositum esse indicare videtur;" (on the perfect imperative, see note on I 11.29). He adds, " neque $\begin{gathered}\text { ढ̈rau, quod deteriores exhibent, placet, praesens expectamus, }\end{gathered}$ aut intelligendum potius verbum in hac formula."
§ 6. A second precept for 'answering'. 'When a conclusion is being drawn, if your opponent puts the conclusion in the form of a question,
 accusative absolute. It is here passive, not middle, though the vetus translatio renders it concludentem, which is contrary to the sense required and to the general use of the verb, which is rarely found in the middle. Spengel even asserts non dicitur media forma, but this assertion (unless I misunderstand his meaning) is refuted by Top. H $5,150 a 33$, paquo yà $\mathfrak{c} v$


 taken as any other than the middle voice).












 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta o u$ s.



इoфok $\lambda \hat{\eta} s]$ On this statesman and orator (not the poet), and on the ten $\pi \rho \rho^{\prime} \beta_{o v \lambda}$ or of whom he was one, see note on 114.3 .
cỉӨuvópevos tîs í申opías] 'called to account for his administration of the office of ephor'. The ephors are charged with being liable to venality in Pol. Il $9,12706 \mathrm{IO}$, dià tì̀ daropian ©iviou. The ephor in the present instance repudiates the charge, and insists that he had not acted on the prompting of bribery, but ' on principle' ( $\gamma \nu \omega^{\prime} \mu \eta$ ).
 neither put a further question after drawing the conclusion nor express the conclusion itself in the form of a question, unless the truth of the facts is superabundantly clear'. Comp. Top. $\Theta 2,154$ a 7, already quoted on § 2 .
§ 7 treats very briefly of 'jests', as a useful accessory in debate; Ridiculum acri Fortius et melius magnas plerumque secat res (Hor. Sat. I 10. 14). The subject of ridiculum is treated by Cicero de Oratore, II 58.236 seq., Quintil. vi 3.22-112, haec tota disputatio a Graecis mepi yє入oiov inscribitur (§ 22)...usus autem maxime triplex, aut enime ex aliis risum petimus aut ex nobis aut ex rebus mediis (§ 23). For other references see note on I 11.29.
 that you should confound (spoil the effect of) the seriousness of your opponents by ridicule, and their ridicule by seriousness'. In a Scholium on Plat. Gorg. p. 473 E, (where Socrates says to Polus) yenâs; ä $\lambda \lambda \lambda$ av̉









 Baiter and Orelli，p． 910 b 20；Sauppe，Fragm．Or．Att．III 131）．The only material variation between the two forms of quotation is Aristotle＇s probably intentional alteration of t⿳⿵人一⿲丶丶㇒一⿱亠乂⿱一土儿，dercticov，which would apply to the
 the remark to all the three branches of Oratory．Dr Thompson observes that＂the remark is one which could not have been made by an ordinary man，and the sentence is too nicely balanced for a mere colloquial dictum＂（Gorgias，p．178）．The first half of Gorgias＇precept may be exemplified by the familiar line，And coxcombs vanquish Berkeley by a grin（Dr Brown＇s Essay on Satire II 224）．

One of the best classical instances of the effective use of pleasantry to neutralize over－strictness on the part of one＇s opponent is Cicero＇s good－ humoured banter of his friends Sulpicius and Cato，in the speech pro Murena（\＄$\$ 19-30$ and $\$ \$ 61-65$ ）．We may also compare Dem．Or． 54 （karà Kóvovos）$\$ \$ 13$ and（as an illustration of meeting jest by earnest）20，



 der Griechen und Römer，§ 29，Ueber Lachen und Wits．



 Off．I 29．103，ipsum genus iocandi non profusum nee immodestum，sed ingenuum et facetum esse debet，§ 104，facilis est distinctio ingenui et ali－ beralis ioci．
 oratorem，ut nee nimis frequenti，ne scurrile sit．．．neque ant sta persona ant iudicum ant tempore alienum．There is a kind of quiet irony ob－ servable in Aristotle＇s hint that the orator is to select his special line of pleasantry according as he happens to be a gentleman or the reverse．
eipoveia－itifov］＇Irony is more gentlemanly than buffoonery：one who resorts to irony makes his joke for his own amusement only，whereas the buffoon does so for an ulterior object＇．On $\beta \omega \mu 0 \lambda{ }^{2}$ ia，comp．Eth．Nit．IV 14，









 фeíyoutes rò ó $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ кроóv: see also the references in note on II 2.24, to which may be added Auctor ad Herennium Iv 34. 46, where irony is called permutatio.

It is a nice question whether aưrov̂ èveka is neuter (as Mr Cope takes it in the text of the Introd. p. 366), or 'perhaps masculine' (as he suggests in the note, and as I have ventured to translate it above). The latter is the view supported by Victorius: "Qui utitur dissimulatione, sibique semper in sermone detrahit, atque aliis plusquam vere concedi possit, tribuit, ut ipse oblectetur, voluptatemque ex aliorum stultitia capiat, hoc facit. quare sibi servit : contra scurra ridiculus est, et iocos undique captat, ut alii voluptatem gignat, quod illiberale ac sordidum est, omnia facere, ut alii turpiter inservias."

## CHAP. XIX.

The book appropriately closes with a chapter on the Peroration: the contents of that portion of the speech are distributed under four heads : ( I ) to inspire the audience with a favourable opinion of yourself and an unfavourable one of your opponents, (2) amplification and extenuation, (3) the excitement of the emotions of your audience, (4) refreshing their memory by recapitulation.

Cornificius, II 30.47, gives three divisions, (1) enumeratio, (2) amplificatio, (3) commiseratio. Cic. de Inv. 1 52.98, (1) enumeratio, (2) indig. natio, (3) conquestio. Apsines 12 p. 384, (1) àvá $\mu \nu \eta \sigma t s$, (2) đ̀eos, (3) סei-
 miseratio are sometimes brought under one head, thus reducing the divisions to two, as in Cic. part. orat. 15.52, (1) amplificatio, (2) enumeratio (Volkmann, die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer, § 29).

In spite of what is here said about $a u \not \approx \eta \sigma \iota s$, the student of ancient eloquence cannot fail to be struck by the quiet character of most of the perorations of the Attic orators. Perhaps the tamest of all (to our modern




 remarked by Brougham that "the perorations, if by this we mean the concluding sentences of all, in the Greek orations, are calm and tame, compared with the rest of their texture, and especially with their penultimate




 portions, which rise to the highest pitch of animation' (vol. viI, Rhetorical Dissertations, pp. 25, 184; see also especially Jebb's Attic Orators I p. chi).
 own case to be true and your opponent's to be false; and after that, to use praise and blame, and to elaborate these topics'. These words give the reason for giving the first place in the four heads to inspiring in the audience a favourable opinion towards yourself.
 context. Victorious dubiously explains it: "expolire et quod factum aam ' est cursim festinanterque oo consilio ut concinnes, iterate ac repetere.' It is metaphorically used in Arist. Nub. 422, where Strepsiades offers himself (not his son, as Ernesti says Lex. Techno. s.v.,) to Socrates, as sturdy and tough material for him to hammer upon and forge to his purpose,
 $\pi а р$ '́ $о \iota \mu$ ' ä̀ ${ }^{\prime}$ (for a Latin metaphor from the anvil, comp. Horace, A. P. 441, male tornatos incudi redder versus). At first sight the word might be supposed to refer to ává $\mu \nu \eta \sigma \iota s$, which is subsequently explained in the words mo 入入ákıs eimeiv, in which case it would mean 'to hammer your subject down', 'drive it home'; but $\mu \in \tau$ à rov̂ro in § 2 shews that in the present section Ar. is only dwelling on the first of the four heads of the epilogue, and does not at present touch on àvá $\mu \nu \eta \sigma \iota s$, which is. reserved for § 4. Consequently we must understand it to mean 'to elaborate', 'to finish off', the topics belonging to the first head. It may also mean to mould the audience to one's purpose. Brandis in Schneidewin's Philologus iv i, p. 45, points out that his Anonymus read the clause
 Kev́ $\epsilon \nu$, in which case the last word corresponds to the third head,

' Now (in this) you must aim at one of two objects; to represent yourself as either relatively or absolutely good, and your opponent as either relatively or absolutely bad'. As is remarked in the Introd. p. 368 , 'the virtue assumed may be either virtue per se, and independent of all other considerations, as times, places, and persons-or in default of this, at any rate good to the judges or audience ; as it may be, useful, or well-disposed'. On $\dot{a} \pi \lambda \hat{\omega}$ s, see note on I 2.4.

## єїр $\eta \nu \tau a \iota ~$ oi то́тои] See I 9. I.

§ 2. $\delta \in \delta \delta \epsilon(\gamma \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu-\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu]$ ' The next point in the natural order is to
 depreciate (what has been proved by your opponent); for the facts must be













 admitted, if one is to treat of the question of degree (by way of amplification or the reverse) ; just as the growth of the body arises from something preexisting.' $\delta \in \delta \in t y \mu \in{ }^{\nu} \nu o \nu$ is supported by the vetus translation and all the mSS except $A^{e}$, which has $\delta \epsilon \delta \epsilon \epsilon \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$, an awkward genitive absolute which is left standing alone owing to the loss of some words which would have made the sentence run like the next transition in § $3, \mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha}$
 that the participle refers to " ipsam argumentationem, ie. confirmationem et confutationem, quod suadent verb deî $\gamma$ à $\rho$ тà $\pi \in \pi \rho a \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ v a ~ o ́ \mu о \lambda o-~$ $\gamma \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \mathrm{a} . "$
ëккєıутає oi tóto!] See I cc. 7, 9, 24 ; and II 7. 2.
§ 3. $\mathfrak{\eta} \lambda i \kappa a]$ referring particularly to ave $\xi \in \iota \nu$ каì тaтeเขoûv.
en leos] 'commiseration'. Tic. de Inv. I 55. 106, Conquestio oratio auditorum misericordiam captans, ib. § 100. Supra II 8. 2.
$\delta \epsilon i \nu \omega \sigma \iota s$ ] 'indignation'. See note on 112 I .10 , $\sigma \chi \epsilon \tau \lambda c a \sigma \mu \hat{\varphi}$ (correspond-
 272 A, è $\lambda \epsilon \iota \nu o \lambda o \gamma i a s ~ к a l ~ \delta e \iota \nu \omega ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega s . ~$
 and IO. I; on $\zeta \grave{\eta} \lambda o s$, II II. I.
oi то́тot] See II cc. 1-11, where however סeivaots and êpts are not, like the other topics, specially treated of.
§ $4 .^{\text {. }}$ The remaining branch of the peroration is the recapitulation of the previous parts of the speech. At this point you may appropriately do what some, absurdly enough, advise one to do in the exordium. They recommend you to to state your points again and again that they may be distinctly understood. In the exordium, however, you should simply state the subject of the speech, that the point at issue may be clearly seen ; in the peroration you have to state summarily the means whereby your case has been proved'.










§ 5. 'The first point (in the recapitulation) is (to state) that you have performed all that you have promised'. Isocr. àri8oots § 75, oimat

'(The recapitulation) may also consist of a comparison (of the opponent's case with your own); you may either compare what both said on the same point, or else (you may do so) without setting each point over against the other'.
 preceding part of the section, ix mapaßo力 $\bar{\rho} s$ cannot be contrasted with oüt $\omega$ s, but must be identical with it. Hence we should either strike out this clause, or at any rate (with Victorius and Spengel), put $\bar{\eta}$ into
 жараßo $\overline{\text { jिs. }}$. Possibly, however, the clause is due to the intrusion into the text of a marginal explanation of ouvios such as an abbreviated form of $\boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma$ ovy (the scholiast's common equivalent for scilicet) ic $\pi$ $\pi \rho a \beta 0 \lambda \bar{\eta} s$.

кarà $\phi \dot{v} \sigma \iota \nu]$ i. e. your recapitulation may follow and contrast your own points in the natural order, as they were spoken; and then, if you please, separately, what has been said by your opponent.
rèevì̀- óyos $\quad \eta$ ] 'As a conclusion (to a speech) the most suitable style is that which has no conjunctions, to make it a true peroration, and not an actual oration'.
reגeutij is with much plausibility conjectured by Victorius, and the conjecture is supported by F. A. Wolf. The nominative is possibly due to the copyist being misled by the apparent parallelism above, dapò


íni入oyos....̀óros] Quint. vi 1. 2, nam si morabimur, non iam enumeratio, sed quasi altera fiet oratio. Supra ini 9.6, ai mepiodol ai makpal

 all; the facts are in your hands; I ask for your verdict'. Considering the carelessness of style which characterizes many portions of the Rhetoric, it is all the more striking to find its close marked by a sentence so happily chosen,-a sentence which at once illustrates the point under



consideration and also serves as an appropriate farewell to the subject of the treatise; as though Aristotle had added at the conclusion of his course : 'I have said all that I had to say; my lectures are now finished; I leave the subject in your hands, and trust it to your judgment'. The closing words of the Sophistici Elenchi are at least equally effective,



The illustration is doubtless a reminiscence of the closing words of one of the best-known speeches of Lysias, Or. 12 (kat' 'EparooӨ'́vovs), $\pi$ av́бouat
 may perhaps find its modern equivalent in some such words as these :
' The speech for the prosecution must now close; I have appealed to your ears, to your eyes, to your hearts: the case is in your hands; I ask for your verdict.']

## APPENDIX (E)

## Shilleto's Adversaria on the Rhetoric of Aristotle.

[Among the books belonging to the late Mr Shilleto which have been recently acquired by the University Library, are two interleaved copies of the edition of the Rhetoric printed at the Oxford University Press in 1826. One of these, which is in bad condition owing to many years of use, contains a large number of annotations of very unequal value, written in various hands; in the other, which bears on the title-page the name Richard Shilleto with the date Dec. 15, 1863, apparently all the notes on which his maturer judgment set any value, are copied out by himself in a hand rivalling that of Richard Porson for clearness and beauty. All these notes, and a few selections from the older book, with some trifling omissions, (parallel passages, for instance, already quoted at large in these volumes,) I have transcribed in full by permission of the Syndics of the University Library, and I append them here as an epilogue to Mr Cope's Commentary.]

## BOOK I.












 h. 1. scribe кaтà $\lambda_{o ́ \gamma o y ~ v e l ~}^{\eta}$ катà т то́лоу. Hoc praefero.
3. 2, $\hat{\eta}$ Eecoò̀ civat $\hat{\eta}$ крıгі̀̀ к..т.入.] Cicero Orat. Part. 3. 10, Quid habes igitur de causa dicere? Cicero Pater: Auditorum eam genere distingui. Nam aut auscultator est inodo qui audit, aut disceptator, id est rei sententiaequémoderator: ita, uf aut delectetur, aut statuat aliquid. Sta-
tuit autem aut de prateritis, ut iudex, aut de futuris, ut senatus. Sic tria sunt genera, iudicii, deliberationis, exornationis: quae quia in laudationes maxime confertur, proprium habet iam ex eo nomen. I de Oratore 31. 141, (non negabo me didicisse) causarum...partim in iudiciis versari, partim in deliberationibus: esse etiam genus tertium, quod is laudandis aut vituperandis hominibus poneretur. de invent. II 4. 12, omnis et demonstrativa et deliberativa et iudicialis causa...Aliud enim laus aut vituperatio, aliud sententiae dictio, aliud accusatio aut recusatio conficere debet. In iudiciis quid aequum sit quaeritur, in demonstrationibus quid honestum, in deliberationibus, ut nos arbitramur, quid honestum sit et quid utile.
 Herm. ad Plat. Rep. III 389 A. [Rhet.] III 17. 8, Isaei Ciron. Hered. § 27;
 907, 1 Aphob. 834, Aesch. Choeph. 64, 470, Plat. Symp. 204 A; Lucian, I p. 22, Somnium 17; Bremi ad Aeschin. adv. Ctesiph. §78; Lysias de olea $108 \mathrm{St}=264 \mathrm{R}$, Theomnest. $116 \mathrm{St}=344 \mathrm{R}$ et $117 \mathrm{St}=350 \mathrm{R}$; Herod. VII IoI, Lys. xiii § 16, Dem. VII 83 § 28.


 p. 265, 266.




 just so far larger as not to render'. Si voluisset Ar. 'so that we make our movements not more tardily', scripturus fuit пoteío $\theta a t$.

 quod $\pi 0 \lambda \nu \chi \rho o v i \omega s$ ä入ıuтos, ut in Tac. XI Ann. 5, continuus inde et saevus accusandis reis Suillius.-[oűr'] Bekk. st. De ov̉dè...ov' vid. ad I 3.8.
 Fragm. XCIV, p. 105, 106. "Schol. Vratislav. Pind. Olymp. xiii 78, тоиิтo


 Plutarch. Dion. I. Vox $\mu \eta \nu_{i \epsilon t \nu}$ interpretationi cessit apud Aristot. Rhet. I 6."
 Pindarus optima res aqua; not for the excellency but for the common use of it." Bacon, Speech Touching Purveyors, vol. Iv, p. 306, ed. MDCCXXX.
 be none, except perhaps in the seldomness and oftenness of doing well." Hooker, Eccl. Pol. i 8. 8, vol. 1, p. 290, ed. Keble.
 (sapientes sive omnes sive quam plurimi; cf. II 23.12) $\dot{\eta}$ (aut) of $\pi \lambda$ cious $\hat{\eta}$ (aut) ol крárıбтos.
 Memor. IV 4. I6, Eur. Heracl. 197.
9. 2,] Quintil. III 7.6.
 quod $e i t$.

9. 38, $\sigma u v_{j} \theta_{\text {elay }}$ ] Cicero Brut. 12. 48 (Ait Aristoteles) Isocratem primo artem dicendi esse negavisse, scribere autem aliis solitum orationes, quibus in iudiciis uterentur. Quid sibi velit Bekker ex uno Codice praeferens ảovví $\theta_{\epsilon} a y$, quum reliqui tres $\sigma v v^{\prime} \theta_{c}$ av praebeant, parum intelligo. Cf. III 13.3. ["Jebb, Attic Orators II p. 68 note 2. Surely dंбuvídecav is utterly inconsistent with 111 I 3." Note in Shilleto's older copy of Rhet.]
9.41, ехонévшу] Cf. $1122.11,16$.
 u.s.]
11. 23, "Not only what is great strange or beautiful, but anything that is disagreeable when looked upon, pleases us in an apt description... for this reason therefore the description of a dunghill is pleasing to the imagination, if the image be represented to our minds by suitable expressions; though perhaps this may be more properly called the pleasure of the understanding than of the fancy, because.we are not so much delighted with the image that is contained in the description, as with the aptness of the description to excite the image." Addison, Spectator, 418.


 фáocess deîtal $\mu$ ónov.
12. 28, ois xapıồvtal] "ovis A exhibere Thurot Rev. Arch. Iv 299 dicit." Spengel.
13.12, ávrevtotề] àv' єv̉ пotê̂v. [See Shilleto's article in Fournal of Philology viI, No. xiii, p. 157].
 Porson) scribendum aut пioveıs omittendum tanquam gloss. vocabuli degías.
 Dem. Pantaen. p. 978 § 4 I.
15.10, ' ' $\boldsymbol{\prime}$ ' о́лотє́pov к.т.入.] Cf. II 4.32. Suspensa et quo ducerentur inclinatura responderet, Tac. XI Ann. 34.



15. 13, $\boldsymbol{\pi} \rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ атoı] vid. Lob. ad Phryn. p. 374, 375.

## BOOK II.




 ful aspect begins to abate, and my hatred to arise," Scott, Kenilworth ch. xix. "Under this iron domination scarce a complaint was heard;
for hatred was effectually kept down by terror," Macaulay, Hist. Eng. I p. 628.
 of procuring a remission for you provided we can keep you out of the claws. of justice till she has selected and gorged upon her victims; for in this, as in other cases, it will be according to the vulgar proverb, "First come, first served." Scott, Waverley ch. LxiI. "After the first storm there is naturally some compassion attends men like to be in misery." Clarendon,



 Quid sibi velit Bekkerianum avirov́s, me quidem latet:


 older copy].

4. 31, $\dot{\text { i }} \mu \sigma \omega \bar{\omega}]$ Ennius 379, quem metuunt, oderunt: quem quisque odit, periisse expetit. Ovid II Amor. 2, 10, quem metuit quisque perisse cupit.


6. 10, пávza: vid. ad 9. 3.






 Symp. 186 C.



9. 3, äтaбıv] all who possess these two feelings (vímé
 (all who uphold either form of government) yàp ämtoytal fíxaiov rıvós. $\pi a ́ v \tau a=\pi a ́ v \tau \alpha ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \tau o l a u ̂ \tau a ~ 6 . ~ 10 . ~$.



 Bacch. 286), deponentia quae intransitiva sunt (ut Пávakroy èéóvto Botwroùs







Xen．Anab． 11 1．5，§ 159，Anm．4＂Transcribed from adv．on Aristoph． 1．c．］



10．I1，á $\xi$ เov́ $\left.\mu \in \boldsymbol{v}_{0}\right]$＇＇for whom a claim is put in．＇Vid．nos ad Dem．de Fals．Leg．§ 293.






 copy of Badham＇s Philebus，1．c．］．
 тоء т甲ิ тро́тч，Xen．Cyrop．VIII 3．21．


 cum participiis coniungitur．In Xenoph．Agesil．XI 1I，кal rò $\mu$ сүа入óфpov



 нобєєv่єь，publicare，Xen．Hellen．I 7．io．

引̀ ovis ovitot крivovat．

 I 3．6，II 18．4．Vid．nos ad Plat．Protag．33I E．［＂Minus negligenter

 a long note on Protag．l．c．［tò áví $\left.\mu o t o \nu \eta{ }^{\eta}\right]$ rò ö $\left.\mu o t o \nu.\right]$

22．II，ě $\chi \eta$ そrat］passivum est ut § 16.






 $\delta \bar{\eta} \lambda_{o \nu}$ legendum esse $\kappa a ́ v \omega \sigma \iota$ ，ne senarius in prima sede habeat creticum．＂ Quidni oủk＊＊｜ìva ктávшの九 к．r．入．


## BOOK III．

[^24]

 magis propria.
3. 4, Є̈vаица] Lob. ad Phryn. p. 375 (ä้аица 3 codd. Bekkeriani). $\chi^{\lambda} \omega \rho$ ò̀ aipa Soph. Trach. 1055, decolorem Cicero vertit Tusc. II 8.20. Sed vid. Eur. Hecub. 129.
 citat de Rhod. Libert. p. 193 § 12 et locum nostrum. Errat Hemsterh. ad Lucian. Nigrin. 23, Tom. I p. 63. Eadem sententia est quae in Taciti Annal. XIV 57 et XVI 22. фpoúpıov éreıxíAク'Aтa入áyrך (Thuc. II 32); itaque

5.4, пórє] Dem. de fals. leg. § 260.
7.7, $\gamma$ à $\rho$ ] Eth. Nic. v. $10=8.3$ ro $\lambda \lambda a ̀$ ràp.

 contr. Stephan. IroI § I, alibi, dicitur; quidni aeque dicatur cis úmâs et ©s


11.6, Өрárтet $\sigma \epsilon]$ Cobet Nov. Lect. p. 655 "Quid igitur erat quod diceret quum $\theta \rho a ́ r r e ı ~ \sigma \epsilon ~ v i d e r e t u r ~ d i c e r e ? ~ N e m p e ~ Ө \rho a ́ r i n s ~ c l, ~ e ~ T h r e s s a ~$ natus es, ut satis Aristoteles ipse confirmat addens, el $\mu \grave{\eta} . .$. elva.."
II. 13, $\mu$ viona] luscitiosum (Gell. IV 2). Arist. XXXI Probl. 8, oià tí


 et 16... [From Shilleto's older copy].
 duced by the Danish Government about the middle of the last century; but they are understood to have proved a nuisance instead of a benefit. They have not the wolf to check the tendency of their population to exceed the means of subsistence, and they have multiplied so as to devour the summer pastures on which the inhabitants depend for their cattle; and having been allowed to run wild they are of no use." Laing, Norway p. 418.


 -velut "incude formare." [From Shilleto's older copy.]

## GREEK INDEX

## TO TEXT AND NOTES．

```
The references are to Book，Chapter，and Section． a \(2.4^{n}\) refers specially to the note；
\(\beta 7 \cdot 4 \mathbf{n}^{1}\) indicates the notes in small print at the foot of the page． \(a p\) ．for \(a p u d\) denotes words and phrases quoted by Aristotle．
```

àßєлтерía
ázaOòv（defined）
$\pi \in \rho i ̀ ~ r o v ̂ ~ \mu e i ́ \zeta o v o s ~ a ̀ y a \theta o v ̂ ~$

тoîs àya日ज̂s（v．l．）ëXovat

$\beta$ 19．13；24． 10
r 7.3
－12．14；13．1
ảץaтầ Appendix（A）vol． 1 p．294；
F 23.8
a 11.17
a 7.41
àyanâoӨat
тò à $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ anךтóv
B 2.20
$\beta 23.12$
r1I． 5
$\beta$ 24．10；$\gamma 8.2$
a 10．3；13．2，11 ； 15.8
a 14.7
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 16.9$

a6．15 ả乌ク̊ $\mu$ ot ảdıcîv a 12.2
$\beta 6.25$ ảך $\delta$＇̀s $\quad \gamma 8.2$ ；9．2

$\gamma$ 12． 5 ap．$\beta 21.6$

a 9．2I a 9．30；． $\mathbf{\gamma}$ 14． 1 I

|  <br>  |  | ． $\mathbf{a} \kappa \mu \dot{\eta}$ àколабía（def．） | $\beta 12.2$ a 9.9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | àko入acíal | $\beta 6.13$ |
| ＇ $\mathrm{A} \theta \dot{\eta} \nu \eta \sigma$ | $\beta$ 23．11 |  | $\beta 6.4$ |
|  | $\gamma 17.10$ | àkо入абтаіреıу | $\beta$ 23．I |
| $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ à $\theta \lambda a \tau \mu \mu \dot{\eta}$ | a 9． 16 | àкó入aotos | a 10.4 |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 1.4$ |  | a 6.3 |
| à $\theta$ póa катáoтaбıs | a 11．1 |  | a 9.25 |
| ăӨvpra | ap．y 3．2，4 |  | $\beta 12.3$ |
| Aiyıvíras kal Horıòauátas | $\beta 22.7$ | （тótos）ék tov̂ ảko入ovOoûvtos | $\beta 23.14$ |
|  | －$\beta 6.18{ }^{\text {n }}$ | äkos | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.9$ |
| ai8̀ss．a | a 9．20；$\beta$ 6．1＊ | àkpaoía a 1 | 4；12．12 |
| aikial $\sigma \omega \mu$ át ${ }^{\text {v }}$ | B 8.9 | 8i＇à̉pariay | $\beta$ 19． 19 |
| aikiav | $\beta 16.4$ | àkpareís a 12. | ；$\beta$ 12． 3 |
| aikíбauro | a 12.26 | àкратечтıка́ | $\beta 16.4$ |
| ó Aírms ò Soфok入éovs | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 16.11$ |  | $\gamma 12.5$ |
| Alvecioìnuos | a 12．30 | тò àxpıß̇s | a 2.4 |
| aiveròs | － 25.7 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 17.12$ |
| aiviypatı | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.12$ | тà àkpıß̂̀ $\pi \in \rho$ íepya | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 12.4$ |
|  | －21．8 |  | a 10． 19 |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.12$ |  | a 10． 13 |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 11.6$ |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 1.10$ |
|  | $\gamma 2.12$ | ákpıßodoyía $^{\text {a }}$ | a 5.15 |
| （tótos）ék тov̂ $\mu$ ฑ̀ тavito т | roùs aưtoùs áci |  | a 4.4 |
| aipeívAat | －23． 19 | àxpı $\beta$ ¢̂s ópâv | a 7． 18 |
| alpovta | a 5.12 |  | a 2.3 |
| Aiciav | $\gamma 10.7 \mathrm{~g}$ |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 14.8$ |
| Aicxivךs（Socraticus） | $\gamma 16.10$ |  | a 1． 10 |
| aio $\chi$ ¢окєрঠєia | B6． 5 |  | ap．\％3．I |
| aïoxpo入oyeì oủӨéva | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.13$ | àkúpos | a 15． 22 |
| air $\chi$ viv（def．） | B6．2 | à入aらoveíav | a 2.7 |
| aioxừns à̧iovs | $\boldsymbol{\beta} 3.17$ | à入a̧oveias | －6．11 |
| aio $\chi \nu^{\prime}$ | $\beta 6.21$ |  | 23．5， 12 |
| alo $\sigma$ Vעтך入ol a 12．19；$\beta$ | 12．10；13．10 |  | ； 24.7 |
|  | B6．11 | rov̂＇A入кaiou | a 9.20 |
| airxúvoyrat | $\beta 2.22 ; 6.1$ | oi àm＇＇A入кıßıádov | $\beta \cdot 15.3$ |
| Aïธónetot 入óyot | $\beta 20.2$ |  | F 6.23 |
|  | F 20．5， 6 |  |  |
| aireiv．．．ảnaureîข | B 6.7 |  | － 25.9 |
|  | a 5． 17 |  | $\beta 6.17$ |
| Tn airía | $\beta$ 24． 11 | ＇A入кıঠ̈ápas $\quad \beta$ 23．11； | 1，2，3， 4 |
|  | aitiay rov̂ $\pi$－ |  |  |
| paơógov | － 23.24 | $a 13$. | ；$\beta$ 23．I |
| aitrov | a 7.12 | ${ }^{\text {＇A }}$ 入kivov dimó入oyos | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 16.7$ |
| （rótos）àmò tov̂ aitiov | － 23.25 | d $\lambda \lambda{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $a 15.18$ |
|  | $\beta 14.4$ |  | ¢ фai－ |
| áкцá̧ovtes | $\beta$ 14． 1 | $\nu \in \sigma \theta a t$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.9$ |
| áкцá§оитоs | a 5．II |  | F 23.3 |


阝4．9； $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 1.9$
$\beta 17.6$
a 5．II
ap．y 6.7
a 2．18；$\beta 25.14$
גขтоy

á $\mu а р т a ́ v \in เ \nu$
及 20.6
y 16.9
y 2． 10

a 12.14
d $\mu a ́ \rho т \eta \mu a$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 15.3$
व̊ $\mu а р т \eta ́ \mu а т а ~(d e f)$.
a 13． 16
 yopeî̀

A 23． 28
＂Арабเs＇

－ 8.12

ад $\mu \pi є \chi о ́ \nu \eta \nu$
a 11.4

ả $\mu$ v́ทтоע
$\dot{\mathbf{a}} \mu \phi i \beta \circ \lambda$ os
$\dot{\alpha} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\text {ó入 }}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ ols
今4． 16
72.10
a 15.10

Y5．4
a 2.4

－13． 10

$\gamma 16.6$

а $\mu \phi \iota \sigma \beta \eta \tau \eta \sigma i \mu 0 เ s$ a 6.18
$\dot{\alpha}^{\mu} \boldsymbol{\mu} \iota \sigma \beta \eta \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma a \iota \epsilon$ a 3.6

âv consopitum
a 1． $5^{*}$
${ }_{a} \nu$ with opt．after certain particles．Ap－ pendix（D）vol．IL p．336；$\beta$ 20． 5 ； 23.7
$-\hat{a} \nu$ and－$\iota \hat{a} \nu$ ，verbs ending in，a $2.18^{*}$ ávaßo入 ${ }^{\prime}$
àvaßo入ウ̀ $\chi$ ро́vov
ávaßo入ウ̀ $\chi$ рóvıos
$\gamma 10.7$ m
a 12.8
àvaßo入 $\hat{\eta}$ ö $\mu$ оtov
a 12.8
ai èv roîs 8ıAupáयßots àvaßo入aí $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.6$ àvi т $\omega$ ע àvтıテтрó $\phi \omega \nu$ ảvaßo入ás
àváyєoӨal
$\gamma 9.6$
ávaykaîov $\quad \beta$ 25．9， 10 ；$\gamma 15.3$
тò dンayкaîov $\lambda$ ขтฑŋóv

a 11． 4
àvayкаîa ás émi rò mo入̀̀
àvayкaíay



a 2． 17
a 2． 14
－ 25.10
a 10.9
a 12.14
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 15.3$

| $\lambda a ̂ a s ~ a ̀ v a ı o ̛ ̀ ̇ s ~$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| та́ขта ảvaıpeí | a 15.33 |
|  | $a 15.21$ |
| àvaıpeî̀ rảvavria | $\beta 18.1$ |
|  | va $\beta 21.11$ |
| àvèngs | $\gamma 17.15$ |
|  | $\alpha 14.5$ |
| àvaıperıká | 8.8 |
| àvaıбXขvtia | 5 |
| àvaıбXuvtia（def．） | 2 |
| a่ขa้ $\chi$ ขขreîข | 3 |
| aเซХยขтоขิซเข | 36． 1 |
| àvaíX ${ }^{\text {verob }}$ | $\beta 13.10$ |
| （rónos）тарà rò ảvaírıov eis aitrow $\beta$ 24， 8 |  |
| àva入aßeîv ròv àxpoarív |  |
| àvalaßóvt¢s |  |
|  |  |
| àva入oyia |  |
| нетафорà кат＇áva入oyíav | $\boldsymbol{\gamma 1 0 . 7 k}$ |
| （цєтафораі）ai кar＇àva入oyiav y 10． 7 a |  |
| àyádoyov |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $\beta$ aiveıv $\quad \beta$ 23． 17 |  |
| ék тov̂ àvá入o¢ov |  |
| тท̂s ảvá入oyov |  |
|  |  |
| тоîs ảvá入oyov．．．taís ảvá入oyov |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $\lambda$ 入тькลิ้ et sim． |  |
| a 2．8，14；$\beta$ 25．12， 14 |  |
|  |  |
|  | 1 |
|  | $\boldsymbol{x} 17.6$ |
| а่ขарททิбає | $x 19.2$ |
|  |  |
| àmò àvavo̊ ${ }^{\text {coias }}$ | 阝6．13 |
| ＇Ava§axópas | $\beta$ 23． 11 |
| ＇Ava̧̧avס̧íiov iapßeiov | $\gamma 10.7$ |
|  | $\gamma 12.3$ |
|  |  |
| ảvǎ̧̇ats какотрауiats | $\beta$ 9． 1 |
| ảváтa入ıข |  |
| àvanav́reıs |  |
| àvanๆpía | $\beta$ |
| ảvamveî | $a$ |

тávta ảvaıpeí
a 15.33
a 15.21
$\beta 18.1$
$\beta 21.11$
$\gamma 17.15$
a 14． 5
ק 8.8
$\beta 3.5$
ק 6.2
$\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ II． 3
ק 6.1
$\beta 13.10$
$a 13.4$
a 9.28
B9．1I
y $10.7 k$

ค 7
a 7.4


Balvelv $\beta$ 23． 17
т
iv rథ̣̂ ảעá入oyov y 4． 3

 $\lambda \nu$ ткк人⿻上丨 et sim．
a 2．8，14；$\beta$ 25．12， 14
è той ava入urınois oteplotak a．2．18



àmò àvavo̊pias $\quad \beta$ 6． 13
Alagaxopas $\quad \beta 23.1$ I
$\gamma 10.7 c$
y 12． 3

B 9． 1
a 7.12

B8． 10
a 2.18

| àvaбkevá̧eıv | － 24.4 | four varieties of divticeipeva（note） |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ap．y 2． 10 |  | $\beta$ 19．1＊ |
| àvaotpéqєбӨat | 阝 6.27 | àvtıкрои́б刀 | 阝 2.9 |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 11.8$ | àvtixpovars | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.6$ |
| àvarpéquar тàs ả̀入入orpias vav̂s | aves $\beta$ 23．11 | àvri入ézoutas | P3．5 |
|  | $\beta 6.25$ | àvtı入oyia | 13．3；17．16 |
| ท่ขठрато8íбауто | $\beta 22.7$ | ＇Avtipazos | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 6.7$ |
|  | $\beta 9.15$ |  | apud $\gamma 3.3$ |
| àvôpia | a 5.6 | àvtırateì | 阝4．31； 5.8 |
|  | a 9.8 | а̇vтıлараßа入ウ＇ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 13.3,4$ |
| àvoplavromotía | a 11.23 |  | $\gamma$ \％19．5 |
|  | － 23.22 | àvтıтараßä入入оитеs | a 3.9 |
| ＇Avठоотín | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 4.3$ | àvтıтараßä入入есข | a 9.38 |
|  | $\beta 17.2$ | ol ảvtırooov́mevos тavitøs | a 2.7 |
| àverı $\lambda$ ท̇rovs | $a 4$. | àขtıтоьо̂̀тes | 阝 2.5 |
| àvíkãt | $\beta 13.14$ |  | 阝 2.7 |
| àve入cú $\theta$ epos | a 10.4 |  | $\boldsymbol{\beta} 2.9$ |
| àve入cúdepor | $\beta 13.5$ | ＇Aขtıo日évis | 3 |
|  | －6．5， 7 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.6$ |
| dve入лiotov | $\beta$ 5．14 | àriorpoфos | I．I |
| ${ }_{\text {ä }}^{\text {decots }}$ | a II． 29 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.6$ |
| ăvev tóx ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | a 5.15 |  | －ัทтผิข $\gamma 9.1$ |
|  | a 13.18 |  | 25．2；$\gamma$ 17． 15 |
|  |  | àvтıбv入入оуıбápevov | $\beta$ 25． 1 |
|  | a 13.17 | àprıteivovtas | $\beta 4.19$ |
|  | a 5.10 |  | $\beta 4.2$ |
| aitías àv $\theta$ рштtukás | a 2.7 |  | $\beta$ 2． 19 |
| àvcapóv | ap．a 11.4 |  | － 6.27 |
| àv＜ẫ¢ | $\gamma 14.9$ | ék tov̂ Me入cáypov toû＇Avtıфผิขros |  |
|  | a $4.12{ }^{\text {n }}$ |  | $\beta 23.20$ |
|  | ； 23.23 （bis） | àvบ́¢¢ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.3$ |
| àvтayळviotaí | B 5.9 | àvorep $\beta \lambda$ ¢́rcos | a 11． 13 |
| àvzaymılotás | $\beta 10.6$ |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 11.5$ |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 15.10$ |  | ap．$\gamma 15.8$ |
| d̀vamosiờvas $\gamma$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma 4 . 4 ; 5 . 2}$ | ¢ข¢́vขนoy | $\gamma 2.12 ; 3.3$ |
| àvramosııóvaı 8iкаио | a 9． 24 | тov̂ İov à̧ıồ | a 13． 16 |
|  | $\beta 2.17$ | à¢ıónเซтov | a 2．4；9．1 |
| àvrepaotás | $\beta 10.6$ |  | － 17.4 |
|  | a 13．12 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.1$ |
| dขтıòıaßá入入єıข | $\gamma 15.7$ | aóópıotos airia | a 10.12 |
| Td̀ $\pi$ Toòs тòv ávtióckov | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 13.3,4$ | dópıora | $\beta$ 22． 11 |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 17.16$ |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 14.6$ |
| àvi $\theta$ eris $\quad \gamma 9$ | r 9．9； 11.10 |  | $\gamma 16.10$ |
| 廿evotis àvtı日̇́бets | $\gamma 9.10$ | àmayopev́eıข | a 15.9 |
| àvтıката入入árтє๐өa！ | $\gamma 15.2$ ， 3 | ánateit | $\beta 1.4$ |
|  | 9．37；$\gamma$ 9．7 |  | $\beta 6.18$ |
|  алтікеєтає | $10.5 ; 11.9$ | àmaidevaiay | $\text { a } 2.7$ |




rầ cis aưròv $\beta$ 2． 1 p． $11^{n}$ ；aúroí $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 1.3$

aủrติ้ ถ̈pya rà rékva

avirovpyó
a II． 26
a 1.2
a 12.25 ；$\beta 4.10$

au̇zóx ${ }^{\text {O}}$ ovas
a 5.5


rìv $\chi$ ápı
dффаvi̧av фúvuv tuvós
dфаvi̧ct rò $\pi$ áOos
dфe入 ${ }^{\prime}$＇s
dфerío
äфетоs
d＇$\phi$＇＇auroû

dфилórıноя
rà dфpooírca
àфродıгса́§оитеs
$\gamma$ II． 13
－ 21.2
B 7.5
a 4.6
$\gamma 17.8$
$\gamma 9.5$
$\gamma 8.5$
ap．$\gamma 11.2$
$\beta 25.4$
a 7.14
－ 9.15
－ 12.3
－ 6.21
àфи́лакто七
áфú入aктa（bis）
耳évous àфळрıб $\mu$ évou

àxapıoteì
＇Axı入入ev́s $\beta 2.6$ ；3．16；24．6；$\gamma 4.1$ ；

|  ＇AX <br>  |
| :---: |
|  |  |


äхорঠos фо́р $\mu \iota y \xi$
á $\psi$ iкороь
${ }^{a} \psi v_{\chi}{ }^{a}$


a 9.27
Bapßapucà
Baptiá（ф $\boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ ）
Bapútys
Báravo

Bagıacía
Baбidev́s（king of Persia）

ßagrá§оутає
－22． 12
a 3.6
a 6.25
r 6.7
$\gamma$ II．II
－ $12.4^{n}$

$$
\text { a } 9.2
$$

$$
\gamma 11.2
$$

a 5.9
$\gamma 1.4$
－ 17.4
a 2.2
a 15.26
a 8.4
－8．II
ap．$\gamma 3.3$
$\gamma 12.2 a$

бкотеiv
B 23.26
$\beta$ éndrıтtos aúròs aúrov̂ ap．a 11.28
$\quad$ a $10.7,14$
Bia

a 11.4

113.4
ó Bios ó $\mu$ er＇à $\sigma \phi$ 人

$\beta \lambda a ́ \sigma \phi \eta \mu o s \quad \beta$ 23．11
Boŋ́өєia a 21． 15
阝 5．17， 18
$\gamma 2.8$

a 13.12

Botwrov́s
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 43$
Bovietal（of tendency or aspiration）
－23．7＊
ßov入ev́ras．．．ßov入eváápevis a7．13
Bovגevtikov́s $\quad \beta 5.14$


B4．3
ßov́ $\lambda \eta \sigma t s . .$. ènı\＆vpia
F 19．19＂


Bрахи́кшло九 $\pi \epsilon \rho i o \delta o 七$
$\gamma 9.6$
Bpúrov
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.13$

$\gamma 18.7$

дá̀a 入evkòv ap．ү 3.3

jàp（nämlich）$\beta 95$ ；11．2；22．3


$\gamma 17.10$
クєıťLầ $\quad a 9.30$
ov̇dì̀ yєtrovías $\chi^{a \lambda \epsilon \pi \omega ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu ~ a p . ~ \beta ~} 21.15$

a 11.29
үє入oîov èv ảpxn̂ тátretv
$\gamma 149$

$\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{f}$ 入oíws
$\gamma 16.4$

a 11.29

$\gamma 14.7$
「モ̂̀ $\omega \nu$ a 12.30

$\boldsymbol{\gamma \in \nu} \mathbf{\nu}$

$\gamma 5.5$



TEXT AND NOTES．
$\gamma^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \rho a$
$\tau \omega ิ \nu \gamma \in \rho o ́ v \tau \omega \nu$ tà $\boldsymbol{\gamma \in v a \tau a ̀}$
$\gamma \in \omega \mu \in \tau \rho i ́ a$
ànò $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \omega \rho \gamma i a s$


रiyvec日at．．．eivaı
रevícӨal．．．eivaı
$\gamma \lambda \omega ิ \tau \tau a \iota$



$\gamma_{\nu \omega} \theta_{l}$ बavrò̀

$\boldsymbol{\gamma \nu a ́ \mu \eta}$（def．）



$\gamma \nu \omega \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$
$\gamma \nu \omega \mu 0 \lambda$ оуєì
$\nu \nu \omega \mu$ одоуias $\pi$ épı

ropyias
र1．9；3．1，4；7．11；14．2；18．7


тà тара̀ $\gamma \rho a ́ \mu \mu a$ бкผ́ $\mu \mu а т а$
үраф́áa
үрафıки́
रрафıкخे 入є́ $\xi$ เs
үрафıкผิข
урафо́ме⿱亠䒑ol $\lambda$ дóyoь
үритà．．．$\gamma \rho v \pi$ о́тךs
ov̌ $\mu 0$ 九 rà 「úyew
$\gamma \nu \mu \nu a ́ \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$
тà кaтà $\gamma v \mathrm{vaîkas}$ фav̂入a
ภqðo
Tò $\boldsymbol{\delta a}$ aóvıov
8актú入ıò
$\Delta a \lambda o y \in v e ̀ s$
8avei̧co 0 ab

סатауŋ́ната
סeठanávŋтаı
anpeíos

a 5．9 סè in apodosi
a $1.11^{\prime \prime}$

a 2.17

$\gamma 11.13$

$\beta 4.9$ סєєì $\mu \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} 146$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { ap．} \gamma \text { 10．2 } & \text { 8eıkтıká } & \beta 22.14\end{array}$
a 5.17 סeıkrık 17 人 $\quad \gamma 17.13$
$\beta 7.4 \mathrm{n}^{1}$ סelldòs a 10.4


$\gamma$ IO． 2 סetvò̀．．．ềnectvò̀ $\beta 8.12$

a5．5 סeiv凶णts $\quad \beta 21.10 ; \gamma 16.7 ; 19.3$

B 24.4

a $15.5,12,17$ סeğal a 14．5


$\beta$ 26．5 8ウ̄入ov 8̇̀ $\quad \beta$ 25． 14


$\begin{array}{lll}\beta 21.9 & \sigma \text { Oat } & \gamma \text { 17．} 10\end{array}$




$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 8.6$ дə $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ ократіаs тèios a8．5
a $11.23 \quad \Delta \eta \mu$ óкрıтоs ó Xîos $\quad \gamma 9.6$
$y$ 12．I， 2 a $\Delta \eta \mu$ Ootévous cis tòv ôn̂mov y 4.3
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 12.2$ j̀ $\pi \epsilon \rho$ i $\Delta \eta \mu 0 \sigma \theta$ évous dík $\quad \beta 23.3$

a4． 12 airian ap．$\beta 24.8$

$\gamma 10.2$ סià yévous $\pi$ गोoutoûyres $\quad \beta 9.9$
a 5.6 did $\mu$ égov $\quad \gamma 10.7 k$

$\gamma$ 2． 10 8i＇$\delta$ ．．．．тì altiay a 1.2


| a 13.14 |  | $a 12.22$ ；$\beta 3.13$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |



a 4.8 ס 8 aßo人 $\eta \quad$ a $1.4 ; \beta 4.30$



a4．3 8ıaypáфєเv $\quad \beta$ 1．9

| diáOrprot <br>  dia日ívcus 8аaíacts סıaípeots （rómos）ix dıaupíacos |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

8cauperío

dencíl

8iaura．．．8iкn


ঠгакартероїитея
диако́лтебӨаь
ठıakpıßoūy
סta入aßeiv als ato
dıa入eктikds
סıä入ектоя Tท̂s cilutulas dıa入ékтov
סLa入úerv
dıa入úety rd oa申és
סta入̀́ot $\tau \mathrm{d} \lambda \eta \theta \bar{\eta}$
 siadvOívia
Dtávota．．．入ikts



dmò duavolas 入éreuv
סıатефеиуótes
diantuxal
סıарı $\theta$ ноиิцта

8taction taî Xepoì
סıaбiگんע
8aactikaı

ס̇arpáyeıv
8аатрьßो
סıaтpıßàs
8атррißєıу
a 11.28
סаатрเлтíoy
ه̇à $\tau$ úx $\boldsymbol{\eta}$

ठıафӨораї крıгஸ̂y
8ıaфорà̀
ठெафи入а́ттєıン
a 13.19
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.4$
a 8.7
a 4.4
a 1.14
r 1.9
$\gamma 2.5$
阝 4.32
r 3.3
a 15.26
a 12.25
$\gamma 4.3$
$\gamma 1.7$
a 15.33
a 13.17阝 26.5
r 16.9
a 13．13
a 4.4

$$
a p . \gamma 16.10
$$

$a p . \gamma 16.10$
$\gamma 5.6$
a 1.5
－ 24.6
B6． 20
Y 17.10
12．5； $\boldsymbol{\beta} 2.2$
$\gamma 16.6$
$\beta$ I0． 7
$\gamma 18.7$
a 12.8
r 135
a4．II

a 12.8 scaұєúdovtat
B 23.3

a 11.2 ठid̈arka入ia
a 1．12；$\gamma 1.6$

a2．I

$\beta$ 23．10 8ı8óagt
F 23． 18
a 1.10

F 1.9
a 7.31 ठяєıле́ $\chi$ Өaє
C 13.9
$\begin{array}{lll}a 8.1 & \text { 8ıє } \epsilon \pi a ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota & \beta 8.10\end{array}$


ot $\quad$ íp ${ }^{2}$ rah（bis）
－ 14.3
$\delta_{\star \imath \rho \eta \mu e ́ v \eta}(\lambda e ́ g(s)$
$\gamma 9.7$
ס̀є入єíl

a4．7；8．1
B 1.7

סıӨvoámßots
8ıQupanßoтонїs
8九ढ̈́vas
y 3．3； 12.2
F 23.6
F 12.14
a 14.3
a 6． 16
a 13.3
a． 9.7
8ıкaıoテv́v（def．）
a 3．9；13．1， 3
B23．2
B 23.3
8ıкаiшs $\pi e ́ \pi о \nu \theta e ̀$
$\gamma 12.1$

סıкаขıкóv a 3.3
8ixaनtìs a 1.7


8ikn táts $\quad a 14.2$
סík $\boldsymbol{s} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\mu} \hat{\rho} \eta$ ．a 3.3

סoûval 8ikŋv（submit to trial） $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 23． 12
סıxo入oyeĩ $\quad a$ I． 11
ò тe入ब́vฑs $\Delta t o \mu$ édon $\quad \beta 23.3$

$\Delta \iota o \mu \eta ं \delta \eta \nu \quad \beta 22.12$

alovívos a 2．19；6．27
ol ànò $\mathrm{\Delta}$ oyvaion
$\beta$ 15． 3
$\Delta ı o v v^{\prime}$ cos（quilibet）
－ 24.5
$\Delta$ tónvolos ó $\chi^{2 \lambda}$ кoûs $\quad \gamma 2.11$
8ıovvбoкó入akes $\gamma 2.10$

## TEXT AND NOTES．

$\Delta$ дoteílet

8เóть
кaì 8ıót七
$\delta \iota \pi \lambda \tilde{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \xi \nLeftarrow$
ס九т入oís ỏvó $\mu a \sigma \iota \nu$
тoîs 8ıт入oîs хрш̂עtat．
ภín $\omega \omega \sigma \iota$

סьш́рике⿱ 8tapía0

a 13．19；
$\beta$ 8． 11
－ 23.22
a 1.11
a 15.28
r3．3
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 3.1$
$\gamma 3.3$
$\gamma 3.1$
a 12.29
a 1.6
15．13
a 12.8
a 11.5
a 2.1
$\gamma 12.3$

 à $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \omega ิ \nu$ ס̀́
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 23.22$

$\beta 1.6$
8ó ${ }^{\circ}$ a
8ógat кal тротáбets
тро̀s 8ógav a 7．36；$\beta$ 4．23， 27 ； $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 1． 5
8оछ̆́óroфо七 $\quad \beta$ 10． 3


доолıко́s

a 5．4；6． 13

$\boldsymbol{\beta} 23.29$
ap．र 3． 3
a 5.14
ه̛̀́vapıs roû $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota y$
${ }^{8} \dot{v} \nu a \mu \iota \nu$ ả $\gamma \omega \nu \iota \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \nu$
катà 8úvapıy

Bvváueıs

8ívatal
ठ̀vyàà

סvóo（indeclinable）

ס̀vá́pıס̊єs
ठ̀vб $\mu \nu \eta \mu$ о́vevtoע

$\Delta \omega \delta \omega \nu i s$
B23． 11
a 13.12
$\Delta \omega \rho เ \epsilon$ v̀s
8ิิpov
a 2.13
a 5.9
－25． $13^{n}$
モ̈ap ék тоv̂ èvıavtoû
ap．a 7．34；$\gamma 10.7$ a
èryizyeotal
$\beta$ 11． 7
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 23.25$
a 7.35


B5．7c
a 10.4
a 12.29
r 1.7
a 13.7
a 12.13
－ 24.2
a 9.33
a 9． 33
a 9.38


ëraфos $\theta a \lambda a ́ t \tau \eta=\quad a p . \gamma 3.1$

éèvoxépatvò $\quad \beta 24$ II
¿ $8 \omega \dot{\omega} \delta \iota \mu a \quad$ a 12.33

èet $\quad a \operatorname{IO} 15$



éOıの日जेनıv a 10．18；11．4
é日lotó̀ $\quad a \operatorname{10.18}$
el $(=\pi o ́ r \subset \rho о \nu) \quad \beta 23.27$
$\boldsymbol{\epsilon i}$ Yérovè $\quad \beta$ 19． 16
cl doin ä̀ $\quad \beta 23.20$
ci．．．ov＇Appendix（C）vol．I p． 301 ；
a 15.23
cï $\pi \in \rho \ldots$ ．．．${ }^{2} 8$ é $\quad \beta$ 23． 1
ci $\pi$ poosoì ä̀ $\nu \quad \beta 23.7$
eïıб $\sigma$ évos $\quad \beta 2.16$

ei̊los $\gamma 13.5$


eïn $\quad$ a 2.22

$\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ I．I

a 9.40
cikós
a 2． 15 ； $\boldsymbol{\beta} 23.22$ ；24．10； 25.8 ， 9 ， 10
ciкóтшv．a 2．14；$\beta$ 25． 10




ikєi入є $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{i v a}$
© ${ }^{\circ}$ en

© ${ }^{6}$ ec
skers

ésedpos
iほará̧eır

ijírクoıv
dEiorntal
iद́ध́orjke


$$
\text { a } 1.9,10,11
$$


ei $\pi i$ roîs кpıraîs


i $\pi d_{\gamma} \gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \mu a$

ìiáyovta
iтayळyウ＇

oủk oikeiov ค́ךторикоís



inaitery


èтaเขoûvтเ $\mu к \rho \grave{\nu} \nu \mu а к \rho \omega ิ s$


тò èmaıveтóy
a 6.24
ëтauyos
a 3.3


$$
a 9.33
$$

ย่тако入ovӨovิซเ

ітараф́є́роитєs
iñavaф́́pety
e่ $\pi$ ávoo̊os
ย̇тауорӨoû̀

е่тауор $\theta$ ஸ́rets


a 1.8
a 4.9
－6． 11
B 24． 11
－23． 12
a 2.8
a 2．8， 9
－ 20.2
－ 20.9
－ 25.8
B23． 11
a 2.8
a 4.12
a 4.13
a 9.2
a 3.5
a 8.5
a 15.26
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 13.3$
a 11.22
－23． 1
－ 5.17
a 13.13
a 13.10

| èníSeuktat | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.7$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | a 1．11；$\beta^{25} \mathbf{2 5}$ |
|  | $\beta$ 19．2I |
|  | $\gamma 17.11$ |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 3.3$ |
|  | $a p . \gamma 13.5$ |
|  | a 12．4，19， 20 |
| inç̧iéval | a 12．24， 35 |
|  | $\nu \quad a 13.9$ |
|  | $\gamma 18.5$ |
|  ठvшáact |  a 7.5 |
| ėmppeá̧凶ข | P 2.4 |

émŋреабнós
B．2．4；4． 30
i $\pi t$－，adjectives compounded with，ex－ pressing tendency or liability to，

B4．${ }^{13}{ }^{n}$
int－，verbs compounded with，implying
reciprocity，
a 13． $9^{n}$

a 6.22

$\gamma 15.10$

a 7.13

a 2.19
é $\pi$ ißou入os $\quad a 9.28$ ；$\beta 21.14$
ѐ $\pi \iota у а \mu і а є$
a 14.5
ol è $\pi เ \gamma \in \gamma \rho a \mu \mu$ évo九
a 15.21

a 13.9
тò é $\pi i \gamma \rho а \mu \mu а ~ т 甲 ̂ ~ o ̀ \lambda \nu \mu \pi \iota o \nu \iota к \hat{\eta}$
a 7.32

a 15.15

è $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ เठеєктเкó̀
a 3.3
етлдеєктькоі̀ 入óyoь
a 3.9

èmıঠ́ǵgto B4．13
 r 3.3

 $a p . y$ 13． 5
，a4．9
eпıоранєì a 15.1
èmtetkés $\quad 木 13.13,19 ; 15.6$

èrıetкeís
 $\beta$ т． 6

a 12.15
тウ̀̀ èmıeíketav тоv̂ 入éyovtos
a 12.28

a 2.4
$\theta$ ârroy
a． 2.4
тoís èrtetкéóv ais òtxalotépots a 15.4

$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 5.7$
imiscevvivas



тà éri $\boldsymbol{i} \in \tau a$
 ė $\pi \iota \theta \nu \mu i \alpha . . . \beta o v ́ \lambda \eta \sigma เ s$ є่ $\pi \iota \theta \cup \mu \eta \tau \iota к о$ í
émıkєХєíp
то仑̂ Є̀тוктท́тоv
é $\pi \iota \lambda a \mu \beta a ́ \nu о \nu \tau a \iota ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu$ ó $\phi \theta a \lambda \mu \omega ิ \nu$
é $\pi \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \sigma \theta a \iota$
є́тı入є́ $\lambda \eta \sigma \tau a \iota$
énìioyos
$\gamma 13.3$

є่ $\pi i \lambda o y o s$＇＇a supplementary addition＇）
$\beta 209$
ẻv énı $\pi \in \lambda$ cía єivat


єं $\pi$ íme
e่ $\pi i \pi \lambda \omega \nu$ кт $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \iota s$
ধ́ $\pi เ \pi$ о́ $\lambda a \iota o s$

єं $\pi เ \pi\rangle \lambda \bar{\eta} s$ eivas

e่ $\pi เ \sigma \iota \tau \iota \sigma a \mu$ évovs



e่ $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \dot{\alpha} \phi \omega \rho \iota \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta$
катà $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$
€่ $\pi เ \sigma \tau \eta ิ \mu \alpha \iota$.
¿彳tテTทTóv
є่ $\pi \iota \sigma \nu \sigma \tau \in \lambda \lambda о ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu$

énเтєเขó $\mu \in \nu a \iota$


ย̇лเтクס̈єiovs тúnous




 є́ $\pi เ \tau \iota \mu \dot{\prime} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \boldsymbol{\omega}$

Є́ $\pi$ เт
$\beta 17.3$
a 12． 19
y 17.10
y 6．I épcítıò，̣́áxos oíklas a 5.7 y 10．4，6；II． 10 a 15．22；$\beta$ 16． 1 $\beta 23.30$ ap．$\gamma 11.3$ $\gamma 10.7 b$ a． 4.6


а 1.7 тє 7 є́ $\rho \omega т \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega s$
a I． 1 épos Appendix（A）
a 1.14
$\beta 19.8$
$\beta$ 24．10；$\gamma$ 17． 10 $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.3$
y $10.7 i$
a 4． $12^{n}$
$a p . y 3.4$
a 11.22
a 4． 10
$\beta 23.18$
$\beta 4.21$
a 12.5
a 12.25
a 11.27
a 1.12
a 15.31 ap．$\gamma$ 10． $7 e$

є่ $\pi i$＇Epyoфìov $\quad \beta 3.13$
Épis $\gamma 11.1$


épıбтькоí
épıбтькаї таиo̊ıaí
кoเvòs ${ }^{\text {E } E \rho \mu \eta ิ s ~} \quad \beta$ 24． 2

$\pi \epsilon \rho i$ тov̂ éбoцє́vov $\quad \beta 19.23$

є̈бтш（popular def．）a $5.3^{n}$ ；6．2；7．2；
10．3；$\beta$ 3．2；4．1；5．1；6．2；7．2；
8． 2
€́таıреía
е́тєро́ $\phi \theta a \lambda \mu$ оs

є̇пітротоs
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 8$ ． I
$\gamma 11.5$

éní申OODov $\quad \gamma 17.15$
є́ $\pi \iota \chi a \lambda \kappa \epsilon$ Úєเข $\quad \gamma$ 19．1
＇Еліхариоs a7．31；ү 9．10
énıхаıре́какоs $\beta 9.5$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { є̇ } \pi \iota \chi \text { аípovat } & \beta 2.20\end{array}$

（то́лоs）тарà тò émó $\mu \in \nu=\nu \quad \beta 24.7$
énoтоьоі $\quad \gamma 3.3$

émov́pமots
ap．y 13.5

ap．ү II． 3
ëpyov
a 2.12

ëpyov Өŋrıкóv
a 11.26
a 9.26
a 1.10
$y$ 14．I
a 11.15

ү 11.15
$\gamma 18.1$
ß 4.28
a 7．41；$\gamma 10.7 a$ $a p . \gamma 7.11$ $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.6$
$\beta 23.12$
$\beta 15.2$
y 5.6
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.5$
a 12.34
a 15.15

AR．III．

| cisyevis．．．yevmioy | － 15.3 | єv̇入apoímevon | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 37$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ciyiveca | a 5.5 | củ入óyıoto | 阝 8.4 |
|  | －15．2 | cijatios（bis） | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.3$ |
| cirnpia | a 5.15 |  | $\gamma 19.4$ |
| culynpes | a 5． 15 |  | a 6.15 |
|  | denerĵs a 5.3 | сن̇цета́ßo入o | $\beta 12.4$ |
| ciodaımovia a | a 5．1； 6.8 |  | a 12.34 |
| ci̇daıноуıбно́r | a 9． 34 |  | 7 9．3；13．3 |
| ci̇diáßo入os | a 12.22 | сѝ $\mu \nu \eta \mu$ оуєито́тєра | C 9.25 |
|  |  | ¢ ิ้ทัเa | B 1.5 |
|  | B 23.30 |  | （́ar）al．4 |
| ci̇okıцойvта | $\gamma 10.1$ |  | rapive $\gamma 4.3$ |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\sim} 15.9$ |  | $\gamma 7.2$ |
| ci®ókıно！ | B4．11 |  | a 2． 13 |
| cidogia | a 5.8 |  | $\beta 2.10$ |
|  | $\gamma 17.15$ | cขึ̃เดто | － 12.7 |
|  | B 1.4 |  | a 11.22 |
| cviantors | －12．8，9 |  | 阝 2．25； 4.8 |
|  | $\beta 12.8$ |  | B4．8 |
|  | a 2． 13 | ¢ง่лорท́боцยท | － 26.5 |
| －${ }^{\text {cepyecia }}$ | a 5.9 | ev̇rpayiá | a 9.19 |
| cispyerimara | a 9． 19 |  | erf． |
| eviepyerinata | a 9.20 | and aor．combined） | a 9．38＊ |
| cن̇epyotikì dívajıs | a 9.4 | Evipıriò $\boldsymbol{s}$ ， $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma 2 . 5 ; ~} 146$ |
|  | a 5.9 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ \％$\quad \boldsymbol{\gamma} 15.8$ |
|  | $\beta 12.7^{\prime \prime}$ |  | $\beta 6.20$ |
|  | Y 1．9； 12.2 | Eưpıríoov＇Eкáß ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | B 23.29 |
| dv cinjuipı¢ | B 3.12 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.10$ |
|  | a 15.25 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 8.7$ |
| ev̇̇ךvia ктпнátcy | a 5.3 | eípunéóov ailtro | ap．a 13.2 |
|  | $\beta 24.3$ |  | $\gamma 12.3$ |
|  | $8 \quad \beta 2.20$ | cṽ\％тoxos | $\gamma 11.5$ |
| Ev̈Ouvos | $\beta 19.14$ | ev̇ou入入oytorórepa | a 1.12 |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 10.7 n$ | eưoúv $\theta$ etos $\lambda$ dóyos | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 3.3$ |
| «u̇⿴囗̇vas סồvac（bis） | $\gamma 10.76$ |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.3$ |
| cviovy $\beta \lambda$ ápon ris dixaia | ia $\quad \gamma 10.7 n$ | củgu์yoxtoy | $\gamma 125$ |
|  | （as $\quad \gamma 18.6$ |  | $\beta 17.4$ |
| viOus ala 10 | a 10．10；11．15 | eùtekvía | a 5．4， 5 |
|  | － 2.9 | cùtedeis | $\beta 15.3$ |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.8$ |  | $a \quad \gamma 7.2$ |
| ยข่катá入入актоs | B 4.17 |  | isis $\beta$ 12．16 |
| тà ev่karépya\％ta | a 6.29 | єن̇тра́тє入o七 $\quad \beta 12$. | 2．16；13．15 |
|  | $\beta$ 2．11， 12 |  | a 5.17 |
| cúко入о | $\beta 4.12$ | eviruxia a 5．4， 1 | 17；$\beta 17.5$ |
| Ev̇erทingey | a 14.3 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 5.6$ |
| cindaßfîs | a 12． 19 | cíqueís | a 6.29 |
|  | imißoviov a 9.28 | ev̇фvâ $\gamma^{\text {ávn }}$ | $\beta 15.3$ |
| ๔ỉaßeirat | a 12.6 | củdoous | $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 10．1 |


| cv̇фuia | a 6． 15 |  | a II．I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\gamma 2.10$ |  | a 6.7 |
|  | a 11.5 |  | ap．a 11.8 |
| ＇́фарно́ттєıข | a 15.10 | тò $\mathrm{\eta}^{\text {¢ }}$ í | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.8$ |
|  | 1， $2 ; 17.6$ |  | a 5． 11 |
| ¢́фєоıs $\quad \beta$ | $\beta 4.31{ }^{\text {n }}$ | ท̇déa à ${ }^{\text {abalà civa }}$ | a 6.7 |
| é¢ı¢ $\mu$ évovs | $\beta$ ıо． 6 | ท̊¢éa | a 11.8 |
|  | $\eta s \quad a 6.7$ |  | a 11.22 |
|  | $a p . \gamma 10.7 c$ |  | $a 11.4{ }^{\text {n }}$ |
| ¢́форía | $\gamma 18.6$ |  | a 11.6 |
|  | $a 4.3$ | グ8ıov | a 7.23 |
|  | a 11.10 |  | a 11．16 |
|  | $\gamma 1.2$ |  | \％3． 3 |
| еххо́лevos | $\gamma 8.4$ |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 16.8$ |
|  | $\beta 4.31$ |  | $\beta 21.16$ |
|  | B 4.30 | $\ddot{\eta} \theta \in \iota$ тov̂ $\lambda$ éyovtos（note on | on $\eta^{\prime} \theta$ os and |
|  | a 9.24 | $\pi \mathrm{a}$（ ${ }_{\text {os }}$ ） | a 2.3 |
| roùs roîs aùroîs éx Opoús $^{\text {a }}$ | B4．7 | $\eta \theta_{\eta}$ ，three kinds of，notes on | on，a $8.6 ; \gamma 7.6$ |
|  | a 6.24 | ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ Oous | a 2.4 |
|  | a $\beta 2 \mathrm{I}$ ． 11 |  | \％ 6 \％$\quad$ 7．6 |
| éxivos | $\beta 20.6$ |  | a 2.3 |
|  |  |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.1$ |
| §ŋ̀入os（def．） | $\beta$ ili． 1 |  | ípovtal） |
| Sǹ ${ }^{\text {os }}$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 19.2$ |  | 18．1；21． 16 |
| $\zeta \eta \lambda o v \mu$＇́vous | a 5.5 |  |  |
| $\zeta \eta \lambda o v ิ \sigma \theta a t$ | B4． 24 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 17.12$ |
| ऽך入 $\dagger$ тoi | $\beta$ II． 5 |  | a 9.28 |
| $\zeta \eta \lambda \omega \tau{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\beta$ III． 4 |  | $a p . a \mid 1.25$ |
|  | B6． 24 | ท̄＾ıkes | － 6.12 |
|  | $\beta$ II．I， 3 | ทi入ıkiat $\quad \beta$ | （ 2． 11 ； 12.2 |
|  | a 12.4 |  | $\beta 12.8$ |
|  | F4．9 |  | $\beta 13.8$ |
| трòs ä入入入ov | a 9.28 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 8.4$ |
|  | $\beta 13.9$ |  | ยvouิชเข a 5.6 |
| тоòs тò ка入óv | $\beta 14.2$ |  | a 14.1 |
| тn̂ $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{i} \mathrm{i}$ ¢ | $\beta 12.8$ | $\dagger^{\nu} \nu($ was defined to be）a 6．23 | 23；7．7，8，28； |
| $\tau \underline{\chi} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\iota}$ | $\beta 12.12$ | A 7．5； 13 | 13．15；$\gamma 2.6$ |
| $\tau \hat{\nu} \mu \nu \eta{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta$ | $\beta 13.12$ |  | ap．a 13.2 |
|  | $\beta 13.14$ |  | ap．$\gamma 6.7$ |
|  | a 12.28 |  | $\beta 10.5$ |
|  | a 12． 10 |  | H22．6 |
|  | \％II．13， 15 | тà＇Hpak入eítov | $\gamma 5.6$ |
|  |  |  | $\beta 3.2$ |
| $\eta$ alternative，prefixed to intersentences， | rrogative | ${ }^{\text {＇Heódotos（ }} \mathbf{1 1} 30$ ） | $\gamma 16.5$ |
|  | F6． 27 | ＇Hpodótov Өovpiov | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.2^{\prime \prime}$ |
|  | ；6．22， 24 ； |  | $\gamma 8.4$ |
|  | 6． 12 （bis） |  | a 12.6 |
|  | a 10.11 |  | $\beta$ 24．11 |

## INDEX TO

| ฑ̈rtous toû Өvjoû | $\beta 12.5$ | ¢̈pyov Aךтıкóv | a 9． 26 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| тoû kepôaivect | B 5.7 | $\theta \lambda i \beta$ ¢eı | a 5． 14 |
|  |  | Oopvßoû̀rat | a 2． 10 |
|  | － 5.17 |  | $\beta 23.22$ |
|  | $\beta 5.21$ | Oориßсítat | $\beta 23.30$ |
| Oappeiv， $\begin{aligned} & \text { úpoos } \\ & 5\end{aligned}$ | F 5．16，14． 1 | кагат入ท่т | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.5$ |
| тà $\mu$ ¢́ $\lambda$ 入ovta | $\beta 5.18$ | Oopvßov̂́ıи | $\gamma 18.4$ |
|  | a II． 21 | Өpagúßoudos | $\beta 23.25$ |
| OavMá̧ovat | a 6.29 |  |  |
|  | a 11.18 | $\lambda \in{ }^{\text {b }}$ | － 23.29 |
|  | óv a $\quad$ II． 21 | Opacíra才os év roîs ềéoıs | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 1.7$ |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma 2 . 3}$ | Өрабímexos | $\boldsymbol{\gamma 1 1 . 1 3}$ |
| Oаvцабтаi $\quad \beta 6.2$ | 24； $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.3$ |  | － 2329 |
| Ocayévns èv Meqápots | a 2． 19 | àmò Өрасунáxov | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 8.4$ |
| $\theta \epsilon \lambda \in \epsilon \nu$（for usual prose form |  |  | a 9.29 |
|  | $\gamma 16.3$ | $\theta \rho a \sigma$ óry | $\beta$ 14． 1 |
|  | a 15.32 | $\theta \rho a ́ t \tau \epsilon 1$ | $a p . \gamma 11.6$ |
| тò $\theta$ ¢ $\lambda^{\text {ect }}$ | a 15.31 |  | － 23.27 |
|  | a 15.32 |  | ${ }^{\text {jugas }}$ |
|  | a 15.32 |  | －21． $\mathrm{II}^{*}$ |
|  | a 15．30， 32 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.9$ |
| $\theta \in \lambda \omega \sigma$ | $\beta 24.7$ |  | a 10． 17 |
|  | $\beta 19.25$ |  | $\beta 13.13$ |
| Өє川ıбток入йs | a 15．14 | Ovцккоі́ | $\beta 12.5$ |
| $\theta_{-\theta \in \nu}$ ，peculiar use of words ending in， |  | Ovjaidets | $\beta 12.9$ |
|  | a 11． $16^{n}$ |  | ap．a 6.23 |
|  | $\beta 23.17$ | Ovalafévovs | $\beta 21.11$ |
| Alas ò Ocodécktov $\quad \beta$ | $\beta$ 23．20， 24 | Ovoral | a 5.9 |
|  | rov $\quad \beta 23.3^{n}$ |  |  |
|  | $v \quad \beta 23.11$ |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 1.9$ |
|  |  |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 8.4$ |
| eiv rois Өtodektciols | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.9$ |  | \％$\quad \gamma 88.4$ |
| Өєódopos | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 11.6$ | laots | a 142 |
| $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ Өєód $\omega \rho \rho \boldsymbol{\nu}$ <br>  | $\dot{\gamma} 13.5$ |  | a 12．31 |
|  |  |  | $\beta 4.31$ |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 11.6$ | iarpeúmara | $\gamma 14.7$ |
|  | $\gamma 2.4{ }^{n}$ | iatpıkグ | a 2.1 |
| $\theta \in \rho i \zeta ¢ \iota \nu$ какйs | ap．$\gamma 3.4$ |  | $\beta 2.13$ |
| $\theta \in \rho \mu$ oi | $\beta 13.7$ | i＇Sos кaì катà $\mu$ ¢́pos | a 15.21 |
| ¿ $\theta \in \omega$ ¢ós | a 3.2 | \％̊los ขómos a 1 | 10．3；13．2 |
| $\theta \in \omega \rho$ ض́лата | a 4.4 |  | a 6.28 |
|  | \％$\quad \beta 23.6$ |  | a 9.26 |
|  | ros $\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { ¢ } 23.3\end{aligned}$ | Lisa | $\beta 22.12$ |
|  | $a p . a 11.25$ | ílıa ȯvópata | $\gamma 5.3$ |
| өпpevitiv | 阝 21.15 |  | $\beta 23.5$ |
| ．$\theta \eta \rho \in \cup \tau<\kappa \eta$＇ | a 11.15 |  | $\gamma 12.2$ |
|  | a $\mu$ ci̧oy a 14.5 | ＇18pıcìs | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 4$. |
|  | a $5 \cdot 17$ | liéval eis tò kãà фúgıv | a 11. |

iepoov $\lambda \in$ eìv
＇Íf́p $\omega$
iкavòv
iкeтqpià
iцarıס̊ápıov

＇Intias
＇I $\pi \pi$ о́лoхos


Өクंß $\boldsymbol{\beta} \sigma \iota \nu$＇I $\sigma \mu \eta \nu i o v$
＇I $\sigma$ okpárךs
a 7．5；13．9
$\beta$ 16． 2
a 5．II
y $10.7 l$ ap．y 2.15
$\gamma$ 16．1I
a 2． 11
a 9.38
－2． $17^{n}$
ap．ү 3.3
阝23． 11
a 9． $3^{8}$
$\beta$ 19． 14 ；23． 18
$\gamma 10.7 i ; 11.7 ; 17.10 ; 17.16$（bis）
（Paneg．§I）$\gamma$ 14．2


 ＇Irokpárəs（Evagoras）
$\beta 23.12$
a 4.13
ioropiá

a 4.8
īXupòs
a 5.12

阝 2.14
$\boldsymbol{i} \sigma \chi$ v̀s（def．）
a 5.12
－ 13.2
$\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 23． 11
$\beta$ 21． 2 ；23．8， 17

тò ẗ $\sigma \omega s$ кai тá $\chi a$
＇Іта入ьผิтаь
＇Iфıкра́тŋs

$$
\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.10 ; 10.7 c, k ; 15.2
$$


$\pi \rho o ̀ s ' A \rho \iota \sigma \tau о ф \hat{\nu} \tau a$
$\beta 23.7$



каӨáлєє
каӨáplos $\mu$ оı $\chi$ ós kaOapious
kaӨiそovtes
каAć入ov，opp．to кarà $\mu$ épos

$$
\text { aI.7; 2. 15ter, } 18
$$

кaÓ́lov a 2．9；13．13；$\beta 25.8$
ข่ாò тò av่тò кaOó入ov a 2.19
каӨó入ov kal тєрі €́кáotov
то̀ каӨ ếкабтоу каӨó入оv
a 3.9
a 2.18
 kai，$\delta e ̀$ and re

кai．．．8̇̇ $\quad a 6.23^{n} ; \beta 22.3$ ；23．18
kal．．．kai $\gamma$ 1．3，9

каเขà $\lambda e ́ \gamma \in \iota \nu \quad \gamma I 1.6$
кaıpol
a 7.32
каıрoi aïrtos
a 5.9

今 7.3
кaкà бvyáyєا tov̀s ávӨpátovs a 6.20

какоŋ่ $\theta \in \iota$ ，какоŋ́ $\theta \in \iota a \quad \beta$ I3．3
какоךӨıбтє́ov $\quad \gamma 15.10$
кaкo入ó
какотаӨєîy
－ 20.6

какоípyov a 1.10
kakoupyia $\quad \beta$ 12．15；13．14
какочрүıка́ $\quad \beta 16.4$
$\sigma \omega ́ \mu$ атоя какผ́бєбt $\quad \beta$ 7．3； 8.9
калám $\gamma$ ท̂pas ap．$\gamma 10.2$
Ka入入ías a 2．11；$\beta$ 4．31；$\gamma 2.10$
$\kappa а \lambda \lambda_{\iota \epsilon \pi о \text { îто }} \quad \gamma 2.3$
Ká入入ıттos al2．29

Ku入入ıб白év
$\beta 3.13$
Ka入入ібтратоs a 7．13；14．1；$\gamma 17.14$
кá入入os a 5.11
кá入入os òvó $\mu$ atos $\quad \gamma 2.13$
$\kappa a \lambda \lambda \omega \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\prime} s \quad \beta 24.7$
$\kappa a \lambda$ óv（defined）a 9.3
тà ka入à．．．8̀v́o yє́v $\quad a 6.7$
$\mu \in \tau a \phi o \rho a ̀ s ~ a ̀ \pi o ̀ ~ к а \lambda \omega ิ \nu \quad \gamma 2.13$

$\kappa а \mu \pi u ́ \lambda \Phi \quad \beta 21.2$
кăv єi a $1.5^{n}$
кауळ̀ $\sigma \tau \rho \in \beta \lambda$ òs
aI． 5
$\kappa а \pi \eta \lambda \epsilon i a \quad \gamma 10.7$
Kapkivov Myঠ̇iaq $\quad \beta 23.28$
ó Kap\＃áӨıos rò̀ 入aүá $\gamma 11.14$
ка́рлтıа
a 5.7
karà（＇in the case of＇）a 7．2I

катаß入áттєє ${ }^{\text {ä }} \lambda \lambda \eta \lambda a \quad \gamma 17.6$
кarayє $\boldsymbol{\lambda a ̂} \nu \quad \beta 2.12$
катаன́ıкá̧єıv $\quad$ a 15.28
катакор $\grave{~} \quad \boldsymbol{\gamma} 3.3$
кaraкópөs $\quad \gamma 7.7$
ката入入актıкผ́тєроs a9．31
ката入入árтєбӨat a 9．24；12．24

катаутєкрv่
r 19． 5
кататаи́єбӨaє
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катат $\lambda_{\text {ク̇rтovat roùs àkpoaràs }}$
кататрайעєเข
катабсштầ
катабкечá̧etv
кaragreválew rowvítous
ката⿱亠䒑evárete
катабкеvaбӨ̂̀̂vaı

katáбrafts

катафро́ขךбьs
катафроиттько́s $\beta 2.24$ ；11．7；15．2
катафроисі́бӨаи
ката廿ev́dec日at $\quad a 15.26$
日âtrov
a 15.26

a 2.20
катеเлеív
кате入өєì
$\beta$ 5．7；$\gamma$ 15．10
（ $\lambda$ е́ $\xi \iota \nu$ ）катєбтра $\mu \kappa \dot{\nu} \eta \nu$
катеvоркїбаутая
кате́хє兀

катпүо́рес
－23．13
r9．1， 3 $a p . \gamma 3.1$
a 5.14

кагэүopia
－ 13.7
a 14．I

катокктєірєьу
кároтtpò $\beta$ íov
каторӨойขтеs
a 3.3
a 10.1
阝 20.6
ap．y 3 ．I
B2． 10
і̀ катор $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\dot{\omega}} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \iota$
кат $\omega \rho \theta \omega \omega \sigma$ 人
катш́p $\theta \omega \kappa \in \nu$
Kavivos đ̈pws
кахйлоттоє
кагшцо́бато

 a 15.12
кєктїб $\theta a \iota . . . \chi \rho \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$
кеvo入oyєiv
кєทั่ $\boldsymbol{\nu}$
кєрацєѐs кєрадєі̂

$\sigma_{\tau} \lambda \lambda о \gamma \iota \sigma \mu \omega ิ \nu \pi о \lambda \lambda \omega ิ \nu \kappa є \phi a ́ \lambda a \iota a \quad \beta 24.2$

wis ì kє申а入aí
кефа入is
кехрךнє́vos

Y 14．8； 19.4
$\beta 16.3$
$\beta$ 19． 10
F 23.12

| кехроуткótes | －3．13 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma 4} 3$ |
| Køфıбódoros $\quad \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 10． | $\gamma 10.7 a, f, g$ |
|  | a 15.7 |
| oi àmò Kípmos | $\beta 15.3$ |
|  |  |
|  | ap．$\gamma 10.7 k$ |
| kivorvos | B 5.2 |
| kıvठ̀vveutixòs | a 9.29 |
| кıขêข ${ }^{\text {ätepoy }}$ | a 5.12 |
| кıทฑิбat | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 1.8$ |
|  | －23．13 |
|  | a 11.1 |
| K入єофөิ\％a 15.13 | a 15．13；$\gamma 7.2$ |
| к入ө́ттєтаи с̇̇ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.5$ |
| к入е́птетаи | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.10$ |
| тòv к入е́quavta $\lambda a \beta$ ¢ì | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.10$ |
| кéк入ептаи | $\gamma 2.10$ |
|  | $\beta$ 2．2；$\gamma$ 5．2 |
| K入éف⿻ | $\gamma 8.1$ |
|  | B6．24 |
|  | ¢ás $\quad$ a 8.4 |
|  | 阝 20.4 |
| тథิ коะข¢ิ | a 5.6 |
| коเนที่ | a 6.16 |
| коıyò dixaus | a 13.2 |
| кouvòs עópos | a 13.2 |
|  | － 21.11 |
| коıрal пiotets | $\beta 20.1$ |
| коıขà | $\beta 22.12$ |
|  | $\beta 24.2$ |
| Toùs кoıvoùs ópoícs пávt ${ }^{\text {v }}$ | ávrov al 2.22 |
| коıvórepoy | I． 10 |
| kotvovía | $a 13.2$ |
| коเขめvicòs | － 24.2 |
| ко入акеías oqneía | \＆ 6.8 |
|  | a 11.18 |
| кó入acts | a 14.2 |
|  | as ëvera a 10.17 |
| ко́入aбıs oixetต̂̀ | B 3.5 |
|  | $\gamma 2.12$ |
| ко入oßò̀ пoteiv | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 8.6$ |
| à̇i ko入otòs tapà ko入otò ${ }^{\text {d }}$ ap | ap．a 11.25 |
|  | $\mu \mathrm{\nu}$ ，．a 9.26 |
| колผิขта | $\gamma$ 11．13 |
|  | $\beta 24.11$ |
|  | $) \quad \boldsymbol{\gamma 8 8 . 4}$ |
| кобرеір | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.10$ |

$\kappa \epsilon \kappa \sigma \sigma \mu \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta \nu(\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu)$
ко́ $\sigma \mu$ оя
ко́б $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ о七
ко́тоу ё $\chi \in \iota$
коттáßıa

к $\rho є \mu \dot{\mu} \theta \rho a$
крє́ләтаи
K $\boldsymbol{\rho} \epsilon{ }^{\omega} \omega \nu$

oi kpivoures
ènì toîs крívougr
（то́тоs）ék крїєшs
крıтŋ̀s


oi kpıral дapí̧ovaa
Kpıtias
Kроíбos＂A入uv 8ıaßás
a 15．13；$\gamma 16.3$
тà $\mathfrak{\rho a ́ d i c a ~ к \rho v ́ \psi a ̨ ~}$
ap．$\gamma 5.4$

a 12.33

a 13.2
$\kappa т \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ к а і ̀ ~ \sigma \omega \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu ~$
кvavó $\chi \rho \omega \nu$
кивєíaь

кขкầ
тà $\kappa \check{u} \kappa \lambda \boldsymbol{\chi}$
Kúkvos
kvviria
．kvvidious（bis）
kuyopaïotal
кúves ov̉ dákyovtes toùs кaAi̧ovtas $\beta 3.6$
кข̃ $\omega$
a 9.26
a 5.3
ap．$\gamma 3$ 3． 1
a 11.15
B 20.4
ap．a 9.20
a 9．33； $\mathbf{\gamma} 5.4$ ；14． 10
－22． 12
a 11.15
r 4.3
$\beta 20.6$
ó Kú $\omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$
－ 24.2
кúpıos $\alpha$ 8．2，3；15．9， 21 ；$\beta$ 10． 11 ；$\gamma 2.6$
кúpıo九．．．äкvpo七

тà $\kappa$ úpıa
кúpıò öyo
кúpıos крเтท̀s
кขрเต́тєроу
кupเต́raтos
кผิ入oע

$\kappa \omega \lambda$ ขтtкá
$\kappa \omega \mu \omega \delta$ отоьо̀

$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.2$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.2$ кต́pukos
ap．$\gamma$ II．13， 15
－ 23.8 入aâs àvaừ
ap．$\gamma$ II． 3

a 12.30 入aAŋrıkoi a 12.5


$\gamma 14.6$ ムáкшข єv̇Өvvómevos $\quad \gamma 18.6$

a 7．21 $\lambda$ גav日ávetv évó́хєтat $\quad \gamma 2.6$
$a 7.28 ; \beta$ 23．12 $\lambda_{\text {eltovpreiv }} \quad \beta 23.17$




ảyळขเซтıkウ̀ $\quad \gamma 12.2$
àvтікєє $\mu$ év $\quad \gamma 9.7$
$\gamma \rho a \phi ı$ ฑ̀ $\quad \gamma 12.2$
$8 \eta \mu \eta \gamma \circ \rho \iota \kappa \grave{~} \quad \gamma 12.5$
8ıка⿱ו兀кो $\quad \gamma 12.6$

énıбєเктเkウ̀ $\quad \gamma 12.6$


$\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha \quad \gamma 8.1$



（то́тоs）тарà тウ̀̀ $\lambda \in \epsilon \in \iota \nu \quad \beta 24.2$


ムєuкo日éáa $\quad \beta$ 23．27
Mew8̊ápas $\quad$ B 23.25

a 7.13

$\begin{array}{ll}a 15.25 & \dot{\eta} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta\end{array} \quad \beta 2.26$


$\gamma$ 2．2，6 $\lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \mu a \tau a \quad$ a 12．10


$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.10$

$\gamma 9.7$ 入ıßavゃтùs $\gamma 4.3$
$\beta 9.5$ 几九ßuкоі $\quad \beta 20.2$
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$\lambda_{l} \lambda \lambda_{0}{ }^{\mu} \mu \in \nu a$
$\lambda$ เто́s
入оүiگебӨat по́ррш日ev
入oyıкov̀s $\sigma u \lambda \lambda о \boldsymbol{\tau} \sigma \mu$ оv́s
ôıà 入oyıбرóv
入oүıбرòs тои̂ бuんфépovtos



גоуоурáфоs $\beta$ I1．7n；6．5n； $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 12.2$ b；7．7
入óyos（＇fable，＇）
入óyos yiveral $^{\prime}$
入óyov．．．．тоเท́бєшs
入óyou äక̆เov
入óyథ èv $\mu \eta$ óevl eivat


ß 20．2， 5 bis， 7 $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.6$
y 1.9
－ 24.2
阝 2.18
$\gamma 13.1$
－ 3.15

$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 6.1$
a 5.17
 $\beta 20.8$
入o七ઠop $\eta \boldsymbol{\mu}$ а́тเov
ap．$\gamma 2.15$
$\lambda$ ข́eเท
$\lambda \hat{\sigma a<}$ èvoráซet

入थंбоцєท
入é入̀นая

Avko入ẹ́ $\nu$
ムvкóф $\rho \omega \nu$
$\lambda \nu \pi € \hat{\imath} \sigma$ Oat éni тоîs пєтоเทนévols
$\lambda$ ข́z $\eta$
$\lambda$ ขжๆра̀
$\lambda \dot{v} \sigma \iota s$
$\lambda \nu \sigma t \tau \in \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathfrak{i}$

$\lambda$ ขто̀»
a 1．12；$\beta$ 25．1
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 17.14$
a 2.17
－ 26.5
$\beta 23.23$
$\beta 7.3$
$\gamma 10.7 l$
r 3． 1,2
－3： 5
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 9.3$
a II．29；$\beta 8.8$
$\beta 25.1$
a 12.5
－ 26.3

ผ้ รั่ үท̄pas $\lambda \omega \beta$ âтab
ap．y 11.12
a 5． $11^{n}$

$y 16.8$

$\mu a \iota \mu a ̂ \nu$
r 11． 3
накарьбно́s
นакрàv ả $\pi$ aprầ
a 9.34

накро́ßıоя
$\gamma 5.2$

макро́кш入ся
a 5.15
a 5.15
$\gamma 9.6$

䒑axpodoyiay $\gamma 17.16$
дакротépos $\gamma$ 10． 3






тò $\mu$ av日ávecv ทi8v́ a II． 21

رavikòs $\quad$ a 9.29

ца́vтєбเข $\quad$ 5．4；17．10
маутєv́oутая а 13．2；éfаขтєv́єто $\gamma$ 17． 10


нáprupes
a 2.2
нápтus тıбтòs кal єis хрท́бıноs $\beta 20.7$
на́ртирєs талаєоí．．．тро́бфатоє а 15．13
мартирішу 8ıаípєбьs a 15.18
$\boldsymbol{\mu a \chi є \tau \in ́ o v ~}$
$\beta 25.13$
нахๆтıкоі
阝4．12，19

| наХワтடкоц тєрі кє́pס̊ous | a 12．19 |
| :---: | :---: |
| нахワтıкаі таьठıаі | $a 11.15$ |
|  | $\beta 17.4$ |
| $\mu \epsilon \gamma а \lambda$ окорv́фov $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\prime}$ s | ap．y 3.1 |
| $\mu є \gamma а \lambda о \pi \rho$ ¢́тєєа（def．） | a 9.12 |
|  | y 12.6 |

нєуалоұvхia（def．）a 9．II ；$\beta$ 12．11
$\mu \in \gamma a \lambda o ́ \psi v \chi{ }^{\prime} \quad \beta$ 11．2；12．11； 24.7

$\mu \epsilon \gamma a ́ \lambda \omega s$
a 14.3
$\mu \dot{́} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \boldsymbol{\theta} 0$ о
a 5.4
$\mu e ́ j \in$ Oos тท̂s $\phi \omega \nu \eta \hat{s} \quad \gamma 1.4$

a 5.13



$$
\text { a 2. } 20
$$

$\mu$ ب́Oodos
a I．10， 14

a I． 11

a 2.2
e่ $\nu$ roîs $\mu \in$ Өод̀ıкоís єîp $\eta$ тat a 2． 10
ả8ík $\mu \mu \boldsymbol{\mu}$ eǐ̧ov $\quad a 14.1$


$\mu \in \theta u ́ v \nu$ á $\mu a \rho \tau a ́ \nu \eta \quad \beta \quad 25.7$
$\mu \in \iota 0 \hat{v} \nu$ кaì aṽ $\xi \in \iota \nu \quad \beta 18.4$



## yenati


ขウ̈тıos is патípa ктєivas maî̀as кaтa－
$\lambda$ еітєt

роціб $\mu$ атоs $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os
ai $\nu 0 \mu 0 \theta \in \sigma i a \iota$ роно日є大ias


（ $\nu$ о́ $\boldsymbol{\prime}$ оs）évavtios

ó кouvòs עó $\mu$ оs


ìv toîs עó $\mu$ ols éctıy

ขоопра́тьо



ขvãá̧cıข
$\nu \omega \theta \rho \dot{́ r} \eta \mathrm{~s}$
a 15.21
a 15.8
a 15.11
a $15.4,6$
B 6.23
a 13.11
a 4． 12
ap．ү 3.3
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.15$
－ 24.3
a 6.2
10.7 m
$\gamma 1410$
$\beta 15.3$
$\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \boldsymbol{\nu}$ со́v

$\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \nu ⿺ 𠃊 \dot{\eta} \nu \ldots \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \lambda \epsilon \in \xi \iota \nu$

fívos（homonym）
Einvoфávŋs a 15．29，30；

$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.6$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.8$
$\gamma 3.3$
$\gamma 2.3$
$\gamma 11.8$

Tò gú入ılov teíxos
छuvòs＇Edvá入ıos
$\beta$ 23． 18
B 23.27
－ 20.3
a 15.14
$a p$ ． 21．$^{1 I}$

ö8oтоเย̂ข

óơvınpòs
ó8vprıкоí


ő $\%$
oiкeía $\lambda$ égıs
oikeîo ö $\quad$ ода
oikeiov ö $\rho$ os
oikeiots
oixctórefov
a I．2；$\gamma 12.3$
$\gamma 14.1$
阝 8.8
－ 13.15
r 3.4
－ 3.16
ap．$\gamma 13.5$
$\gamma 7.4$
r 2.6

$\gamma 2.6$（тótos）ảnò тov̂ ỏ̀ópatos
 － $\boldsymbol{\beta} 2.20$

тро̀ ò $\mu \mu a ́ t \omega \nu$ понєív $\quad \beta$ 8．14；$\gamma$ 2． 13
про̀ òj $\mu \mu$ а́тшv $\quad \gamma$ 10．6，7 $g, i, k, l, n$ $\pi \rho \grave{o}$ ö $\mu \mu$ át $\omega \nu$（def．）$\gamma$ II． 2
оцоуєעलิע $\gamma 4.4$
$\dot{\delta} \mu \circ \in \theta \nu$ îs $\quad \beta 6.12$

rò ö $\mu$ otov $\quad \beta$ 19．2
ס̈otov $\theta$ ew
тò ö $\mu$ otov ópầ $\quad \beta 20.7$
Sıà tov̂ ofoiov $\quad \beta 25.8$
о́ $\mu \mathbf{0} \boldsymbol{i} \omega \nu \pi \tau \omega \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \omega \nu$
a 7.27



|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 1.9$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| о́moьoтé入єutov | $\gamma 9.9$ |
| о́ноішرа | a 2.7 |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.13$ |
|  | － 24.2 |
| ómшขvíaı | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.7$ |
|  | －3．5 |
|  | 15.21 |


B3． 5
$\beta$ 6． 10
B4． 16
－ 23.29
ү 1.8


## 252

тарстточці́vots
таракагаА $\boldsymbol{\eta} к \boldsymbol{\eta}$
таракца̧́єıи
таралеіфеси
тарал $\eta \rho о \hat{v} \sigma \iota \nu$
таралі́a
тápàos
жаралоуі乌ета， паралоу„ऽó $\mu$ ноя
таралоуі́аабӨа
тарелоуібато
таралоуıбнòs
тарадоуıбтเкós
тараvévovety
тара́тау ё́тєра
тд̀ паратєлоıпнíva
тарабпиаเขо́ $\mu \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\prime}$
тарабкєvá̧̧ı
тарабкеvá§əvбı тo九oútovs
крıтàs то九ои́тоиs тарабкєváб力

 тарабофі乌єбӨal тò̀ іатро́v
таратŋреї
таратทреі̀ тò $\mu$ е́трเov
тарафиés
$\pi а \rho \epsilon \mu \beta a ̈ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \eta ̂ s ~ \pi \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \kappa о \nu \tau a \partial \rho \rho a ́ \chi \mu о v$
$\gamma 14.9$
тареขох $\lambda \omega \bar{\sigma}$ т
тарŋкцако́res

тарі́бшбts
тароиніа
пароцніає

ai таро»нíaı $\mu$ етафораí
ai лароцдiaı $\mu а \rho т о р i ́ a$
жароноíwбıs
тарр $\quad \sigma$ табтєкоі́

B4．21
$\beta$ 13．I
r 33
r9．9； 11.10
a 6．23；12．20， 23
a 11.25
阝 21.12
$\gamma$ II． 14
a 15.14
r 9.9
－ 5.11
B6．13

татágat
－3． 16
$\pi a \tau a ́ \xi \eta$
a 13.9
a 13.4

татра入 $\frac{i ́ a s}{}$
пáтроклоs
$\pi a \tau \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̀ \mu v ́ v \tau \omega \rho$
B 9.4
a 3.6
ap．$\gamma$ 2． 14
ק 38
－ 65
$\beta$ 13． 1
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 4.3$
a 2.11
$\gamma 10.76$
$\gamma 10.7 c$
－24．4； $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.3$
$\beta 25.10$
B 23.3
a 14.1
$\beta$ 25．10；$\gamma 12.4$ a 9．29；$\beta 24.3$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 5.4$
$\beta 1.4$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 11.6$
－ 22.17
a $\beta$ II．I
B3． 17
B9．16
$\beta$ 10． 11
a 15.12
B6． 20
r 2.15
a 2.7


тєр८é $о у т а$ óvóмата $\gamma 5.3$
тоїs пєןtéxovatข
$\gamma 5.3$




$\pi \epsilon$ рíoסos $\quad \gamma 9.3$

$\pi \epsilon \rho เ \pi$ éтєlą a 11.24
$\pi \in \rho เ$ trov̀ $\quad \beta$ I3．5

$\beta 15.3$
тà $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \tau \dot{\alpha}$
$\pi \epsilon \rho і т \tau \omega \mu a$
a 6．28； 9.25
$\pi \epsilon \dot{\rho} \sigma a \iota$

metriias
$\gamma 11.6$
terrelas ap．$\beta$ 23．I
$\pi \epsilon ф \cup к o ̛ t \omega \boldsymbol{s} \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$
$\pi$ téSovta
11．15
$\pi \iota \theta a \nu \grave{\nu}$ каі̀ пıбтóv
a 5.12
a 2．II

тù $\pi \iota \theta a \nu u ́ v$
$\pi \iota \theta a \nu \omega \hat{\nu} \lambda \dot{o} \gamma \omega \nu$ Х $\rho \bar{\eta} \sigma \iota \varsigma$
$\pi \iota \theta a \nu o ̂ ̂ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu a ~$

тікро̀s
Пívóapos
$\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \ell$
тเбтєขtıkòs
тíates
$\pi i \sigma t \iota s$ ảmódeıそís tıs
тїбtєıs коцда

тїтєєs àтоঠєıктıка̀s


$\pi i \sigma \tau \in \omega \nu$ трia єถ̉̊ך
tàs $\pi i ́ \sigma t e \iota s$ фépeıv
тои́тоьs ai $\sigma v \nu \theta \hat{\eta} \kappa a \iota \pi \iota \sigma \tau a i ́ \epsilon i \sigma \iota \nu$
тьбті̀（ $\lambda$ ó ${ }^{\prime}$ os）
$\pi \iota \sigma \tau \omega ́ \mu a \tau a$
IIır $\boldsymbol{\text { Hè̀s }}$
Mitтакós
$\pi \lambda a \nu a ̂ \nu$
$\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda a ́ \sigma \theta a \iota \gamma 8.1$ ；$\quad \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda a \sigma \mu \in ́ \nu$
$\pi \lambda a \tau т о \mu$ ย́ $\nu$ оs
$\Pi \lambda \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu$

ллєоуєктєî̀ a 4．9；$\beta$ 16．5
$\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu\left({ }^{\prime}\right.$ only＇）
a 1．14；12． 10
є่ $\nu \pi \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\rho} \omega^{\prime} \sigma \in \iota$
$\pi \lambda \eta \sigma t a \sigma \mu \dot{s}$


$\pi \lambda о u ̂ t o s ~ a ́ \rho \epsilon \tau \eta े ~ к \tau \eta ́ \sigma \in \omega s$
$\pi \lambda o u ̂ \tau o s ~ o i o \nu ~ \tau \iota \mu \eta$ tics
$\pi \lambda$ оі́тои $\mu$ е́ $\rho \eta$

$\pi \boldsymbol{\pi} \omega \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \rho \omega \nu$
$\pi \nu \in v \sigma \tau \iota a ̂ \nu$
$\pi \nu i \gamma \mu a$
$\pi o \iota \epsilon i ̂ \nu$ and $\pi a ́ \sigma \chi \in \iota \nu$ тоtєî̀（of poems）
© $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.14$
ó moın $\boldsymbol{r} \boldsymbol{\prime}_{s}$（Homer）a7．31，33；$\beta 3.16$

тoเoûyтés тเ a II II
$\pi \epsilon \pi о i ́ \eta \tau a \iota$
$\pi \in \pi о \iota \eta \mu$ ย́voเs ỏvó $\mu a \sigma \iota$
$\boldsymbol{\pi} \circ \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ I． 3


（ $\tau \in \theta \epsilon \omega \rho \eta \tau \alpha \iota)$
र 2.5
лоıクтakí a 11.23

a 6.3
тоьŋтькаї каі̀ трактькаí a 6.6
тoıкi八os $\gamma 16.2$



$\gamma$ I． 1

a 2.2 то入เтeíat тétтарєs a 8.3


$\pi$ тиเт८кウ̀ al 2.7


по入ıтıкòs $\sigma \cup \lambda \lambda о \boldsymbol{\tau} \sigma \mu$ òs $\quad \beta 22.4$
тоîs по入ıтıкoîs a 8.7
$\pi o \lambda \lambda a ̀$ кal ỏ入íya kaì ${ }^{\text {è }} \boldsymbol{\nu} \quad \gamma 5.6$
По入úєvктоs $\quad \gamma$ 10．7f
$\pi \mathrm{o} \mathrm{\lambda v́} \mathrm{\theta} \mathrm{v} \mathrm{\rho ot} \quad$ ap．$\gamma 6.4$
По入uкрátŋs єis тoùs $\mu$ ûs $\quad \beta 24.6$
Пo入uкрátovs єis $\Theta \rho a \sigma i ́ \beta o v \lambda o v ~ \beta ~ 24.3$
$\pi 0 \lambda ข \pi \rho o ́ \sigma \omega \pi \frac{\nu}{}$ ov่ $\rho a \nu o ́ v \quad a p . \gamma 3$ ． 1
modutєкขia a 5.5
mo入vфi入ia a 5．4，16
mo入úфı入os a 5.16
то入úXovs $\quad \gamma 17.14$
$\pi о \lambda v \chi \rho о \nu \iota \omega ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o s \quad a 7.26$



$\beta$ 16．1 $\pi \epsilon \pi \dot{\prime} \nu \eta \tau a \iota$
a 6.22
$\beta 20.4$ ànò $\pi$ о⿱亠䒑口ías $\quad$ a 13.16

$\gamma 10.7 b$ тор $\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma a \iota & \gamma 2.10\end{aligned}$
торьттаi $\gamma 2.10$
$\pi \in \pi$ úpıбтає a 2.2
rópot a4．7，8
$\pi o ́ \rho \rho \omega \theta \in \nu \quad \beta 22.3$
（то́tos）éк тои̂ тобахผ̂s $\quad \beta 23.9$

$\pi \rho а \gamma_{\mu} \quad$ атєи́оутає 1．3，9；2．5


$\pi \rho о \sigma \pi т а і є є \nu$
$\pi \rho о \sigma \pi i \pi т о \nu т а$
$\pi \rho о \sigma \sigma \eta \mu а i ́ \nu \in \iota$
$\pi \rho о \sigma \tau a ́ t a \iota$
нápтирєs 8еттоí，та入аєоí，тро́бфатоє
a $15.13,15$
тò $\pi \rho о \sigma т а т \tau о ́ \mu \in \nu 0 \nu$
$\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \chi \iota \sigma \mu a$
阝 23.18
$\beta$ 19． 10
$\pi \rho о \sigma \chi \rho \hat{\nu} \nu \tau$
a 3．4；$\beta$ 18．3


a 2.22
трота́бєєs $\mathfrak{\rho} \eta$ торикаí

$\pi \rho о т \rho о \pi \eta$
ย́к троїтарх́о́ขт $\omega$

$\pi \rho o v \pi \eta ิ \rho \chi \in \nu$
троутоданßávovтєs


$$
a 3.7
$$

今 23.7
a 3.3
$\gamma 19.2$
a 9．31
a 2.2
－ 21.15
a 12.23
трофоßттєкоі́
трошסоотоі́ŋке
$\pi \rho о \omega \delta ิ о \pi о$ ำтає
П $\rho \omega \tau a \gamma o ́ \rho o v$ є̇ $\pi a ́ \gamma \gamma є \lambda \mu a$
Прштауópas
$\pi т \omega ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota$ ӧ $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ оィає
$\pi \tau \omega \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \omega \nu \pi a \rho о \mu \circ i ́ \omega \sigma \iota s$
$\pi \tau \omega \chi \in ข ่ \in เ \nu$
тт $\boldsymbol{\chi o ́ \mu о v \sigma o s ~ к o ́ \lambda a \xi ~}$
oi $\pi \tau \omega \chi$ oí
пuӨayópas
тикขò̀ ávaтขєî
тиктıкós

тขрє́ттєє（bis）
тирíхршу
тирро́т ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ ¢
тผิोos $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{i}$

|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma 1 2 . 3}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| ṗádia | a 6.27 |
|  | a 6.27 |
|  |  |
| jaOvpía | a II． 4 |
| jákel oikías | $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ II． 13 |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ I． 3,8 |
| ¢́а廿＠ठойขта | $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ II． 13 |

$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 5.5$
a 7．27；$\beta 23.2$
$\gamma 9.9$
$\gamma 2.10$
ap．y 3．1
－ 24.7
$\beta$ 23． 11
a 2.18
a 5.14
a 11． 10
a 2． 18
ap．y 3．1
ap．a15．13
－ 23.29
y 12.3
a 6.27

a 13.8

a 13． 10 คं $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\mu}$ át $\boldsymbol{\nu}$
r 2.5

a 6.7
$\dot{\rho} \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \rho$
a I． 14
ค́クторıкòs $\quad \beta 2.7$






 $\delta_{\iota} a \lambda \in \kappa \pi \iota \kappa \eta ิ s$ ．
a 2.7
тà $\mathfrak{\rho} \eta \tau о \rho \iota к а ́$
a 14． 5


ค̊óта入ov тои̂ ס́ŕpov ap．$\gamma$ 10．7c
p̊verós $\quad \gamma 1.4,8.2$
คீvாaเขóvтшข $\gamma 2.10$

$\beta 13.7$ Va入apis $\quad$ a 15.13
$\beta$ 2． $10 \quad$ т $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu$ ċv $\Sigma a \lambda a \mu i ̂ \nu \ell \nu a v \mu a \chi i \alpha \nu \quad \beta 22.6$

इá $\mu o v$ к $\lambda \eta$ povxias
$\beta 6.24$
इá $\mu$ ¢ $\quad \beta 20.6$
之ámф $\quad$ a 9．20；$\beta$ 23．11， 12
тò бaфés $\quad \gamma 2.8$
बaфףขlei $\quad \gamma 2.6$

$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \mu \nu \mathrm{ail}$ 日eal $\quad \beta$ 23． 12
$\begin{array}{ll}\boldsymbol{\sigma} \mu \nu \text { ós } & \boldsymbol{\gamma} 3.3,4\end{array}$
$\boldsymbol{\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu o ́ r є \rho о \iota ~ ท ี ~} \beta$ ари́тєро七 $\quad \beta$ I7．4
 рúr刀s $\quad \beta$ 17．4
$\sigma \in \mu \nu$ órys $\quad \beta$ I7．4；$\gamma 8.4$
тథ̂ $\sigma \eta \mu a \iota \nu о \mu$＇́vф $\quad \gamma 2.13$
oŋneîov $\quad$ a 2．14， $18 ; \beta$ 5．14； 25.8
тò éк $\sigma \eta \mu$ ciov（то́тоs）$\quad \beta 24.5$
$\sigma \eta \mu \in$ iov $8^{\circ}$ öтt $\quad \gamma 2.6$

סià $\sigma \eta \mu \in i \omega \nu \quad \beta 25.8$
$\pi a ̂ \nu$ onueîo $\quad$ 「 $\beta 25.12$
б $\eta \boldsymbol{\mu}$ еía
a 9.26
$\sigma \eta \mu \in i ̂ a ~ \lambda \nu \tau \grave{\alpha} \quad$ a 2． 18

a 9.14
ảmò oqueínv kaì 入oyím $\quad \beta$ 5．2I

$\gamma 7.6$

| Eqotós | $\gamma 10.7 d$ | бォovoì | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 18.7$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $a p . \gamma 4.3$ | ėv ảyopâ бraȪvas | а 9.38 |
| Eıycıeis | a 15.13 | отаӨท̂vae $\chi^{\text {a }}$ ккойs | ap．y 9.9 |
| 之ıठิךрம́ | $\beta 23.29$ | бта́бıца | $\beta 15.3$ |
|  | $\gamma 2.12$ | отє́ $\mu \boldsymbol{\phi} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ | $\beta 23.22$ |
| $\sigma \iota \mu i \tau \eta s$ | a 4.12 | otevoi | $\beta 12.26$ |
|  | 16．2；$\gamma 2.14$ | àkтウ̀ $\sigma \tau \in \nu$ ótropos | ap．$\gamma$ 3．1 |
| бivvis $\mathrm{a}^{2} \eta \dot{\rho}$ | ap． $\mathrm{\gamma} 3.2$ | $\sigma T \epsilon ́ \rho \eta \sigma \iota s$ a | ；$\beta$ 9．5＊ |
| тà $\sigma k i ̂ \lambda \eta \dot{\rho}$ ıптeiv | a 5.14 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 6.7$ |
| $\sigma \mathrm{K}$ ¢ $\mathrm{v}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 5.5$ |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.7$ |
| oxéwts | a 2．14；4．7 |  | a 2.13 |
| окıаурафía | $\gamma 12.5$ | oтך入ír力s | $\beta 23.25$ |
| Exipuy | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 3.2$ |  | $\beta$ 10． 5 |
| бк入ךрà óvópara | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.10$ |  | $\beta$ 20． 5 |
|  | ap．$\gamma 16.4$ |  | $\beta 21.8$ |
| okúdsov（on health） | $\beta 24.5{ }^{\prime \prime}$ | Erпбixopos | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 11.6$ |
| бкoпós a 5．1； 6. | okotoí a 9．1 | のTolXeiov | $\beta 22.13$ |
|  | $a 1.10$ | arolxeîov кaì tónos | 阝 26.1 |
| okvӨpariós | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 3.3$ | бтoıXeía | a 2.22 |
| бкv入єícเข | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 4.3$ |  |  |
| бкผ́ццата тара̀ үра́цца | $\beta 11.6$ |  | a 6． 1 |
| бк凶゙тто⿱㇒日勺儿 | B2． 12 | тà бтotхeía тò đ̈лоs | B 24， 3 |
| бо入otki\}etv | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 5.7$ | oropyì Appendix（A）vol．I p． 292 |  |
| бо́入оькоь | $\beta 16.2$ | отохá̧¢бӨal a 6．1； $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{21}$ | 5；$\gamma 10.6$ |
| 乏ó入 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | a 15.13 |  |  |
| ท̇ бофia по入入فิv кai Өavцaбт |  | రórevoc a 5．I |  |
|  | a II． 27 |  | 1． 11 |
| боф८テrìs a | a 1．14；$\gamma 2.7$ | Ėpáßa̧ | P 23.17 |
| бофıбтikòs | a 1.14 | ó $\mu$ ¢̀ бтратєvópevos | a 13．3 |
| тоís бофıбтıкoîs $\lambda$ óyots | a 4.6 | отрє $\beta \lambda$ ós | a 1.5 |
| $\lambda u ́ \in t ~ т o ̀ \nu ~ \sigma о ф ı \sigma т ı x o ̀ v ~ \lambda u ́ \gamma o v ~$ | ov $\quad \boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.13$ | отре́фєєע | a 15.10 |
| бофьотıкへิs àmokpıváuєvov | $\nu \quad \gamma 18.4$ | отроуүи入ผ́тата | $\beta 21.7$ |
| 之oфок入йs O．T．774，$\gamma 1$ | 14．6；Antig． | бvyүย́veia | $\beta 4.28$ |
| 912，$\gamma$ 16．9；Antig．456 | 6，a 13． 2 | тò $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \in \nu$＇̇s $\phi$ Ooveîข | $\beta 10.5$ |
| इофок入ins | $\boldsymbol{\gamma 1 7 . 1 6}$ |  |  |
| do．（Antig．） | a 15.6 | $\sigma \nu \gamma \gamma \in \nu$ ข́otepos av̉rós | F 23.8 |
| Eoфок入 $\bar{\eta}_{s}$（statesman and | orator） |  |  |
| a 14．3；$\gamma$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 15.3 ; 18.6$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.12$ |  |
| rov̀s $\sigma$ oфov̀s éni тaîs т̂̂̀ $\pi \lambda$ |  |  |  |
| 8ıatpißovtas | $\beta 16.2$ |  |  |
|  | a 15.12 |  |  |
|  | $v \mu$ ei§ov | бvyүрámцатоs $\quad$ ¢ 56 |  |
|  | a 7．14 | ovypatai al 2 |  |
|  | al $\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { 2．} 24\end{aligned}$ | бvүкатаӨáттєбӨaь$a p . \gamma 10.7$ |  |
| $\sigma \pi o v \delta$ á̧coval（formation of | of pass．） | бúyкєเтаı ék трเผิע ó $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s$ |  |
|  | ：$\beta 3.7$ |  |  |
|  | a 5.8 |  |  |
|  | －17．3 | Ouykivea $\quad$ a 9.38 |  |

$\sigma$ นá $\lambda \varphi \pi a \rho a \lambda \in i ́ \phi \in \iota$
乏ıyeleís
Eเరิךคఱ
$\sigma$ кías $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \beta 0 \lambda \eta \nu$
$\sigma \mu i^{\prime} \tau \eta s$
Eıんんvións a 6．24；9．3；$\beta$ 16．2
бivves àmṕp
т $\sigma k i ̀ \lambda \eta \dot{\rho} \iota \pi \tau \in \imath ̂$
$\sigma K \in ข ́ \eta$
oxé廿us
oxıaypaфía
Exipшy
$\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \rho a ̀$ óvó $\mu a t a$
бк入ך $\rho$ à $\mu$ áттєн
$\sigma$ Kúdion（on health）
бколós a 5．1；6．1；

бKvOpariós
бкv入єícเข
ока́ $\mu \mu а т а$ лара̀ $\gamma \rho a ́ \mu \mu а$
бка́лтоขбเข
бо入о七кiگєเข
бо́入оเкоя
乏ó $\lambda \omega \nu$

a 1．14；$\gamma 2.7$
a 1.14
a 4.6
r 2． 13
$\gamma 18.4$
oфок入ท̂s O．T．774，र 14．6；Antig． 912，$\gamma$ 16．9；Antig．456，a 13． 2之офок入 $\bar{\eta} s$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 17.16$
a 15.6
इoфoк $\lambda \bar{\eta} s$（statesman and orator） a 14．3；$\gamma 15.3$ ； 18.6
 סıatpißovtas $\quad \beta$ I6．2
ขо́ $\mu \omega \nu$ бофผ́тєроע
a 15.12
a 7.14

$\sigma \pi o v o ̊ a ́ \zeta \in \sigma \theta a \iota$（formation of pass．）
$\sigma \pi o v \delta a i ̂ \nu v$ viro $\lambda a \mu \beta a ́ v \in \sigma \theta a \iota$
бтоиסабтเкผ́тєроь
：$\beta 3.7$
$a \quad 5.8$

Zггáßaگ
ó $\mu \eta$ бтратєvó $\mu \in \nu$ оs
a 13.3
oтрє $\beta \lambda$ ós
a 15.10
－ 21.7
$\beta 4.28$
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 10.5$

$\sigma \nu \gamma \epsilon \nu \in ́ \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho$ av่тós $\quad \beta 23.8$

dII． 25
$\sigma \nu \gamma\rangle \iota \nu \omega \dot{\sigma \kappa \in \iota \nu} \mathfrak{a ̉ \nu} \theta \rho \omega \pi$ ivoıs
a 13.16
бvypvตนovikov́s
阝 6.19
$\sigma v \gamma \nu \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \mathrm{~s}$ тєú $\xi \in \sigma \theta a \ell \quad$ a 12.32
бขүүрá $\mu \mu а т о s$ $\gamma 5.6$
бvуүрафаi
ap．$\gamma 10.7$
a 3．I
$\gamma$ I． 5
a 10.4
a 9.38

overopiav
$\gamma 6.1$
बvvrópous
y 6．5，6；15．10；
18． 5
ràs cuvrovias $\lambda$ un $\eta \mathrm{pás}$
бvvఱ́vขนa．．．бvvшvpдiat

бvoтре́фен
бфаирібеเs
офетєрıбно̀s

бхєठ̀̀
$\sigma \chi е \tau \lambda с а \sigma \mu \hat{\varphi}$


$\sigma \chi{ }^{\circ} \hat{\eta}$



ó Eakpátys đौeyev（Menex．）a 9．30＊
 $\lambda a o \nu$

Ewкрatıкà

бळ́ $\mu$ атоs aï $\sigma \chi \dot{v} \nu \eta$

бผ́цатоs à $\rho \in \tau \grave{~ v i \gamma i ́ e a ~}$
бш́цатоs रреі́a
$\sigma \omega \rho \in$ v́єty

тà $\sigma \omega \tau \grave{p} \rho{ }^{2}$
$\sigma \omega \phi \rho о \nu ⿺ 𠃊 о$ í
$\sigma \omega \phi$ рoбvín（def．）
бшф

т $\dot{\alpha} \xi \in \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$ 人26．5；

талєє̀ótทтоs $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i ̂ a ~$
－ 23.8
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 16.8$
－ 20.4
a 1.3
ap．ү 3.3
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 5.20$
a 5.10
a 1.12
－ 15.2
a4． 12
B5． 16
$\beta$ 13． 13
a 9.9


тaтe

$\beta 3.6$
тaтยเขติร
тарадй

àт̀̀ тайто䒑árov
$\tau \varepsilon \gamma$ àp（etenim）
тє $ө \in \omega \rho \eta \mu$ éva
тєӨךүце́voข


| тєӨpu入 $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\text {évov }}$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma 1 4 . 4}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | a 7.40 |
| тò $\mu$ èv àvayкaîov тeкцク́pLod <br>  | $\boldsymbol{\beta} 25.8$ |
| тékpap kal $\pi$ тépas tav̉róv | C 2.17 |
|  | $\beta 25.14$ |
| тekvoтонia | 阝21． 15 |
| тe入e $\sigma$ ¢ópov | ap．$\gamma$ 3．1 |
| тe入ढтウ̀ | $\beta$ 24．${ }^{\text {x }}$ |


тò тêosảya日óv a 6．22

rèios（tandem）a4．12
rà èv rè̀et tov̂ $\beta$ iov a 7.35
тe入ต́vqs $\quad \beta$ 23．3
тє $\mu$ év $\quad$ a 5.9
Tevédòol a 15.13
т́́ppa $\quad \gamma 9.6$
тeтаүн́̀vos a 10.12
тетатеіушутая $\quad \beta$ 12．11
теталєєขผิซ日at $\quad \beta 13.5$
те́токеу

та̀ тетра́лєтра $\quad \gamma 1.9 ; 8.4 ; 11.6$




$\begin{array}{ll}\text { тéquat } & \beta 19.8\end{array}$

réxpy．．．rúx $\quad \beta$ 19．13
теұขıка́татоя $\gamma 15.10$
теХขî̃at $\quad \beta$ 23．5；$\gamma$ 2． 10

$\tau \in \chi^{\nu 0}{ }^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ оуov̂ $\sigma \iota$
a 1.11
тヘ̂̀ тєХขo入oyov́vrav al 2.4

a 2.5
т $\quad$ 入ía
т $\mathfrak{\eta}$ ขos
rì кaì побò̀ кaì пotò
$\gamma 10.70$
rıOévaı èv ėmaìy ap． $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.10$
a 7．21
тयो

a 5．9；6． 13
a 7.30
à $\pi \grave{o} \tau \subset \mu \eta \mu a ́ t \omega \nu \quad a 8.4$

т̀̀ $\pi a \rho$＇éкágтots tímoy a 9.30
＇́ $\boldsymbol{\phi}^{\prime}$ оis тенйтає－a6．14
т九رшрía тои̂ тоьoûขтоs ễ éка
a 10． 17

тımopias тихєì

тít $\theta a \iota$
тò $\mu$ év（supplied）
rò Tíju civau et sim．
èv тotoúrots кalpoîs
roเav̂тa

tóvots
тóvq
i тотько́s



каAátep каl év тоîs тотькоîs
év roîs тотเкоîs $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 22．10；
a 12.18
a II． 9
a 11.13
$a p . \gamma 4.3$
a 7.12
a $7.7 \mathrm{n}^{1}$
B4． 5
a 5.6
ap．$\gamma 10.7$
$\gamma 1.4$
$\gamma 12.4$
－ 22.13
a 2.9
$\gamma$ 18． 5
a 1.12
a 2.22
23．9，13；
25．3； 26.4
$\beta$ 22．13；26．1
то́тоs，бтоххєion

今 23.4

то́тоя a 2．22；5．9；3．17；22．1
то́тоь дга入ектькоі

траүıкóv
трауıкоі


тро́тоя
$\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \tau \rho о \phi \eta_{s}$
т $\rho о ф а і$ і̀ $\eta \mu$ о́бьaє


т $\rho$ ифєроі
трифผิעтєs
ó т $\boldsymbol{\prime} \pi т \omega \nu$
tupavi＇s
тuparvílos rìios
Túx $\eta$（def．）


änò túxps
8ià túx ${ }^{2}$
тш日á́aı
vißpisecv

vipíata
－ 22.13

$$
a 2.21
$$

a 11．23；$\gamma$ 10． 3
$\gamma 3.4$
$\gamma 14.6$
咲 1.3
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 10.7$
a 12.8
a4． 11
a 5.9
$\gamma 8.4$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 8.4$
$\beta 16.2$
－ 6.9
a 13.3
ai8．4；12．9
a8． 5
－ 12.2
a 10.13
$a 5.17$
at 10． 12
$a 12.14$
$\beta 4.13$
a 12.26
－ 2.5
a 13.9

$\beta 6.13$
vißpıs
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 2.3$
च̈ßpıs $\beta 2.5$（def．）；12．15；23．8；
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.3$

v̈ßpets $\quad a 12.35$

vं $\beta$ рıбтıка́ $\quad \beta 16.4$




viyuivè äplotov $\quad \beta$ 21． 5

a 5． 10
v̇yíilääptotov dokeî eival a 6． 10
vólíca（def．）a 5．10
viyceciò $\quad$ a 2． 1 ；$\beta 24.3$
viypòv iòpलิтa ap．ү 3.3

víáápXєєv，єival，$\gamma i \boldsymbol{i} v \in \sigma \theta a \iota \quad$ a $4.9^{n}$

únápXoval фúaıs $\quad a \mathrm{II}$ ．I

vinєкрivovтo $\quad \gamma 1.3$
vitevavtial $\quad a 15.26$


ขimepßaivetv 8ixala a 14．5


év raîs virepßodaîs wis èv raîs ápetais
a 9.29

vime $\rho \beta$ о入aì $\mu \epsilon$ traфорai $\gamma$ II． 5

ขiлєрєпаиขєîv $\quad \beta 6.8$




| ข่тє¢ท่นєроь | $a 7.6$ $\gamma 10.7 e$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| v̇лєคท́\＄avor | $\beta$ 16． 1 |
| vinєрךфаушітєроя | $\beta 17.6$ |
| vinepe $\chi$ о́ $\mu \in \nu$ ข | a 7.2 |
| vimepoxŋ̀ àperîs | a 9.25 |
|  | a 7．31 |
| ข̀лéxecv $\lambda$ оуov | a 1． 1 |

тарссточци́voเs
тараката日ŋ́кп
таракца̧́єıи
таралеіфеси
тара入 $\eta \rho о \hat{\sigma} \sigma \iota$
таралі́a
тápaios
таралоуі̧етаи
таралоуıSópevos
жаралоуібаб秋
тарєлоуібато
жаралоуıб $\mu$ о̀s
таралоуıбтькós
тарауеن́ovotv
тара́тау ётєра
та̀ таратєтоıŋнìva

тарабкєvá̧ィィ
тарабкеvá§əvaı tolov́tovs
крıтàs тotov́rovs парабкєváoŋ



таратทреї
таратпреî̀ тò $\mu$ érptov
тарафиés

$\pi а \rho \epsilon \nu о \chi \lambda \omega \bar{\omega}$
тар $\boldsymbol{\pi} \mu$ ако́тєя
$\pi а р \dot{\mu} \mu \pi \iota \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$
тарі́шшбts
таро»ніа
тарояніая

ai $\pi$ аро九ціая $\mu$ етафораi
ai тароцдiaı цартурía
жароноішбเs
парр $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ сабтıкоí


$\pi a \tau \dot{a} \xi a \iota$
жатá̧ŋ

татралоía
па́троклоs

$\gamma 14.9$

B6． 13

| $\begin{array}{lll} \beta & 3 & 8 \\ \beta & 6 & 5 \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\beta$ 13． 1 |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} \gamma 4.3 \\ \text { a } 2.1 \mathrm{II} \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  |
| $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 10.76$ |  |
| $\gamma 10.7 c$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} \beta 24.4 ; \gamma 7.3 \\ \beta 25.10 \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  |
| $\beta 23.3$ |  |
|  | a 14.1 |
| $\beta$ 25．10；$\gamma 12.4$ |  |
| a 9．29；$\beta 24.3$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \gamma 5.4 \\ \beta & \text { I. } 4 \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  |
| $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 11.6$ |  |
| － 22.17 |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| арабкєváod | $\beta 9.16$ |
| $\beta$ 10． 11 |  |
|  |  |
| latpóv | a 15.12 |
| $\beta 6.20$ |  |
| ptoy | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.15$ |

a 2.7
$\beta 4.21$
$\beta$ I3．I
r 33
r9．9；11． 10 a 6．23；12．20， 23
a 11.25
－ 21.12
$\gamma 11.14$
a 15.14
r 9.9
－ 5 ． 11

F 3.16
a 13.9
a 13.4
B． 29
B 9.4
a 3.6
ap．$\gamma 2.14$

B 3． 16
ap．$\gamma 9.6$
$\gamma 10.76$
$\beta 24.3$
－ 5.18
a 2.19
a 2.1
ap．r 3．2
ap． 77.11



$$
\text { a } 11.12
$$

Hevévis $\quad \beta 23.9$
пе́̀tathos a 5．14

a 5．II

èk rìs Пerap $\begin{array}{ll}\text { itas } & \beta \text { 23．II }\end{array}$
$\pi \in \pi \epsilon \rho a \sigma \mu \in ́ v o \nu \quad a 2.17$


Перıк入ฑ̂s $\beta 15.3 ; \gamma 4.3$ ； $10.7 a, d$ ； 18.1

$\pi є р \iota \mu a ́ \chi \eta т о \nu$ фаєขó $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ уоv a 6.23
$\pi \in \rho i o \delta o s$ év кब́入ots $\quad \gamma 9.5$
$\pi \in$ тíodos $\quad \gamma 9.3$

$\pi \in р \iota \pi$ ételat a II． 24
$\begin{array}{ll}\pi \epsilon р \iota т т о \hat{v} & \beta 13.5\end{array}$

тà $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \tau \grave{a}$
$\pi \epsilon р і т \tau \omega \mu a$ a $6.28 ; 9.25$
$\pi \epsilon ́ \rho \sigma a \iota$
cis ojpyウ̀̀ neceiv
петтtias
$\pi \epsilon \phi \cup к o ́ \tau \omega s$ д́́ $\gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$
$\beta 13.5$
$\beta 15.3$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 3.4$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 11.6$ ap．$\beta$ 23．I
a 11.15
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.4$
a 5.12
a 2.11


INDEX TO


тробттаієьу
тробліттоута
$\pi \rho о \sigma \sigma \eta \mu а i v \in \ell$ тробта́тає
нápтиреs סєттоí，талаıоí，тро́бфатоь
a 15．13， 15
$\beta 23.18$
$\beta 19.10$
$\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \chi \iota \sigma \mu a$
a 3.4 ；$\beta 18.3$
тротáбєєs a 2．21，22；3．7；$\beta$ 18． 2


$$
a 2.22
$$

тротáбєєs $\dot{\rho} \eta$ торикаí
тротрє́лєє то七єì
$\pi \rho о т \rho о \pi \eta$
є́к троӥтархо́ขтшע
ä $\xi \iota a \tau \omega ิ \nu \pi \rho \circ \tilde{\pi} \eta \rho \gamma \mu \in ́ \nu \omega \nu$
$\pi \rho о v \pi \eta ̂ \rho \chi \epsilon \nu$
троито入анßávoутєs

a 3.7
－ 23.7
a 3． 3
$\gamma 19.2$
a 9． 31
a 2.2
B21． 15
a 12.23

трошסопоíๆке
трошठ̊отоí $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\square}$
Прштаүópov є́ $\pi a ́ \gamma \gamma є \lambda \mu a$
Прштауópas

$\pi \tau \omega \dot{\sigma \epsilon \omega \nu} \pi а \rho о \mu \circ i \omega \sigma \iota ร$
$\pi \tau \omega \chi \epsilon ข ่ є เ \nu$
ттшХó $\mu$ оvбоs кó入aફ
oi $\pi \tau \omega \chi$ оi
пи才aүópas

тиктıкós

тире́ттєє（bis）
тирíхршv
тирро́трıх
тผิ入os єi
$\gamma 5.5$
$\beta 7.27 .1$
a7．27；$\beta 23.2$
$\gamma 9.9$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.10$
ap．$\gamma 3.1$
$\beta 24.7$
$\beta$ 23． 11
a 2.18
a 5.14
a 11.10
a 2． 18
ap．$\gamma 3.1$
ap．a 15.13
$\beta 23.29$
＇Paסá $\mu a v \theta v s$ каі $\Pi а \lambda a \mu \eta$＇ס̀ŋs
pádica

 j́a日vuíaь
páket oikías
pa $\boldsymbol{\text { podiáa }}$

$\gamma 12.3$
$\gamma$ II． 13
$\gamma$ I． 3,8
y II．I3

a 13.8

$\gamma 2.2$
$\dot{\rho} \eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\tau} \omega \nu$
r 2.5

a 6.7
ค́ $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\tau} \omega \rho$
a 1.14
คீ $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ торıкòs
B 2.7





a 2.22
yévך трía
a 3． 1
 סєa入єктькฑิs．
a 2.7

a 14.5

a 5． $14^{n}$

ap．ү 2.13
ค́óma入оу тои̂ $\delta \dot{\eta} \mu$ оv ap． 10.7 C

คขтаиขóvтผ上 $\gamma$ 2． 10

$\beta$ I3．7 $2 a \lambda a \mu i s \quad a 15.13$

$\beta$ 24．II $\quad \sigma a ̈ \lambda \pi \iota \gamma a \mu \in ̂ \lambda o s$ ä̀ $\lambda \nu \rho o \nu \quad \gamma 6.7$
इáuov к入дроvхías
阝6． 24
इá $\mu \Phi$ B 20.6
इánф $\omega$ a 9． 20 ；$\beta$ 23．II， 12
тò бафés
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.8$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.6$
ซย่เขov กปี入ov ap． $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ II． 13
$\boldsymbol{\epsilon \mu \nu a i ̀ ~} \theta \in a l$
－23． 12
$\sigma \in \mu \nu o ́ s$
r 3．3， 4
$\sigma \in \mu \nu$ о́тєроє ท๋ $\beta$ ари́тєроє $\quad \beta 17.4$
 ри́rทs
$\beta 17.4$
$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mu \nu$ о́т $\boldsymbol{\eta} s$
$\beta$ 17．4；$\gamma 8.4$

$\begin{array}{ll}\sigma \eta \mu \text { îov } & a \\ 2.14,18 ; ~ & 5.14 ; 25.8\end{array}$ тò ék $\sigma \eta \mu$ cióov（то́тоs）

F 24.5

$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.6$
òà $\sigma \eta \mu \in i \omega$ ע
$\beta 25.8$

$\boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \in \mathfrak{i} a$
a 9.26
$\sigma \eta \mu \in i ̂ a ~ \lambda \nu \tau a ̀ ~$
a 2． 18
тà $\sigma \eta \mu \in i ̂ a ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ a ̉ \rho \epsilon \tau \eta ̂ s ~$
a 9． 14
àmò $\sigma \eta \mu \varepsilon i ́ \omega \nu$ каì $\lambda o \gamma i ́ \omega \nu$
$\beta 5.21$

r 7.6

248

$\lambda_{\text {ıtós }}$
$\lambda o y i \zeta e \sigma \theta a l \pi \dot{\pi} \rho \rho \omega \theta \in \nu$





$\lambda_{0} \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\boldsymbol{i} \omega \boldsymbol{\alpha}}$
$\beta$ 5．21
入oyoypáфos $\beta$ 11．7＂；6．5＂；$\gamma 12.2 b ; 7.7$
$\lambda$ óyos（＇fable，＇）
入óyos $\gamma$ ivetal

$\lambda$ ó́ov äझ̌ov
$\lambda o ́ \gamma \varphi \Phi$ év $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \nu \grave{c}$ civat


及 20．2， 5 bis， 7


$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.6$
$\gamma 1.9$
－ 24.2
－ 2.18
$\gamma 13$ ． 1
－ 3.15
r6．I
a 5.17
入óyous $\gamma 2.7$ ；入óyovs $\beta 20.7$ ；入óyшv $\beta 20.8$

ap．$\gamma 2.15$
$\lambda$ ข̀єル


גи́боде⿱
入є́дขцая

А $\downarrow к о$ ое́ $\omega \nu$
ムuкóфршу
 $\lambda v \in \pi \eta$ $\lambda \nu \pi \eta \rho \dot{a}$
$\lambda \dot{\nu} \sigma$ ıs

тà $\lambda \nu \tau \iota \kappa \grave{~ e ̀ \nu \theta \nu \mu \eta \jmath \mu a r a ~}$
$\lambda$ ขго̀»
a 1．12；$\beta$ 25．1
$\gamma 17.14$
a 2.17
－ 26.5
－ 23.23
－ 7.3
$\gamma 10.7 l$
r3．1， 2 －3： 5
B 9.3
a 11．29；$\beta 8.8$
$\beta$ 25．1
a 12.5
－ 26.3



$\mu \dot{a} \theta \eta \sigma \iota s$ र 10.2 ；$\mu a ́ \theta \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ тахєîa
наıца̂̀
накарьб $\mu$ о́s
$\mu a \kappa \rho a ̀ \nu$ à̉aартầ
a 2.18
$\boldsymbol{\mu a x p o ́ ß ı o 七 ~}$

накро́кшлся
ap．$\gamma$ II． 3
$\gamma 16.2$
a 2． $12 \mu$ н $12 \times i a s$ б $\eta \mu \in i ̂ a$
رадакòs
$\mu a \lambda a \kappa \omega \hat{s} \lambda^{\prime} \dot{\gamma} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$
a 10．4；$\beta 17.4$
$\gamma 7.10$
$\mu а \lambda а х \omega ं т \epsilon \rho о \nu ~ \sigma \nu \lambda \lambda о \gamma i \zeta \omega \nu \tau a!\quad \beta 22.10$

$\mu a ̄ \lambda \lambda o \nu \kappa a ́ \lambda \lambda \iota o \nu(?)$
a 7.18

$\mu a \nu$ Oávetv ค́adics ทidí $\quad \gamma 10.2$
䒑avikòs $\quad a 9.29$

нávтєбเท $\quad \gamma 5.4 ; 17.10$


тì̀ è̀ MapaӨஸ̂̀t $\mu a ́ \chi \eta \nu \quad \beta 22.6$
на́propes $\quad a 2.2$

на́ртирєs паланоí．．．тро́бфатоь а 15.13
$\mu а \rho т и р і \omega \nu$ סıаірєбts
a 15.18
нахєтє́o，
$\beta 25.13$
$\mu a \chi \eta r เ \kappa о i$
阝4．12， 19
$\mu a \chi \eta \tau$ скоі̀ $\pi \epsilon \rho і$ кє́ $\rho \delta$ סus $\quad$ a 12.19

$\mu$ нүа入ádıкоь $\quad \beta 17.4$
$\mu \epsilon \gamma a \lambda о к о \rho и ́ \phi o v ~ \gamma \eta ̄ s \quad$ ap．$\gamma 3.1$
$\boldsymbol{\mu \epsilon \gamma а \lambda о \pi \rho \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon є а ~ ( d e f . ) ~ a ~} 9.12$

$\mu \epsilon \gamma a \lambda o \psi v x i a \quad$（def．）a 9．11；$\beta$ 12．II
нєүало́ұvхos $\quad \beta$ 11．2；12．11；24．7

неүá入os a 14．3
$\mu \dot{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \operatorname{Oos} \quad a 5.4$

$\mu \in \gamma^{\prime}$ Oovs ápexì a5．13

$\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ ठa
a 2.20
$\mu$ étodos a $1.10,14$

a I．II
ठıà $\tau \hat{\eta} s \mu_{\mathrm{E}} \boldsymbol{\theta}$ ódov
a 2.2

a 2.10

тò $\mu$ eiłovos поıךrıк＠ิ eival a 7.7

$\mu \in \theta \dot{v} \omega \nu$ á $\mu a \rho \tau a ́ a \eta \eta$
$\beta 25.7$
$\begin{array}{ll}\mu \epsilon t o u ̂ \nu ~ к a i ̀ ~ a v ゙ \xi \epsilon \iota \nu & \beta 18.4\end{array}$


vewati
$\nu \in \omega \sigma r i ̀ \pi \lambda$ outoûvtes

$\lambda \in і т \in є$

ขоцібнатоs $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os

ขоновебias


（ $\stackrel{\text { ó }}{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \mathrm{os}$ ）évautios
èтé̀ $\eta$ ò $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ о́ $\mu$ оs
ó коıขòs vó $\mu \mathbf{0}$


èv roîs עó $\mu$ oıs égtı

ขобŋ $\mu a ́ r \iota o \nu$
ขoбఱิठes


ขvaтá乌eเv
$\nu \omega \theta$ pór $\eta \boldsymbol{s}$
$\gamma 14.10$
$\beta 15.3$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.6$
$\gamma 2.8$
$\gamma 3.3$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.3$
$\gamma 11.8$

岛evoфávŋs＇Eגcárats
阝 23.27
Eépgns
－ 20.3
тò gú入ıvov teíxos
§uvòs＇Evvá入ıos
a 15.14
ap．$\beta$ 21． 11

ó8onotề $\quad a 1.2 ; \gamma 12.3$

óóvunpòs
ó8̀ptıкoí


ö§ol


oikeiov öpos
oikeíots
oikctótepov
$\gamma$ 14．I
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 8.8$
A 13.15
r 3.4
； 3.16
ap．$\gamma 13.5$
$\gamma 7.4$
$\gamma 2.6$
a 5.7
$\gamma 2.6$
r 2.13
oiketútys
－ 4.28
$\beta$ 19．26；$\gamma$ I． 4
B 23．3， 6
a 12.6
$\gamma 16.8$
$\gamma 2.4$
$\beta 12.8$
－ 132.
r 2.5
a 8.4
a 8.5
－8． 10
a 7.26
$\beta 2.1$
－2．1， 3
B 5.14
a 2.10
$\gamma 14.2$
$\gamma 10.76$
$\beta 2.20$

тро̀ ò $\mu \mu$ а́тшу поєєї $\quad \beta 8.14 ; \gamma 2.13$





тò ö $\boldsymbol{\mu o t o \nu} \quad \beta$ 19．2
\％̈rotov $\theta$ ewpeiv $\quad \gamma$ II． 5
тò ö́potov ơpầ $\quad \beta 20.7$
Ờ rov̂ ơpoiov $\quad \beta 25.8$




$\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ I． 9
одоьотé入єєтоу $\quad \gamma 9.9$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { оноiшна } & \quad \text { a } 2.7\end{array}$


$\begin{array}{ll}\boldsymbol{\delta} \mu \omega \nu \nu \mu i a t & \gamma 2.7\end{array}$



$\beta 3.5$
$\beta 6.10$
B4． 16
－ 23.29
y 1.8

|  | $\gamma 2.5$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | atc $\nu \quad \gamma 2.2$ |
|  | $(\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta) \quad \beta 2.26$ |
| סıтлоís óvóцабт | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.5$ |
| $\grave{i} \xi \in i \underline{a}$（ $\phi \omega \nu \hat{g}$ ） | $\gamma 1.4$ |
|  | $\beta$ 5．11； 12.5 |
| ógúdvuos a 10.4 | a 10．4；$\beta_{\text {5．11）}} 12.4$ |
|  | a 3.3 |
| ópâбӨal àruxoûvтєs | ¢ $\quad \beta 6.24$ |
| ópү̀̀ a 1．4； $\mathrm{\beta}_{2}$ ． 1 （def．） | I（def．）；2．26；$\gamma$ 19．3 |


$\boldsymbol{\beta}$ I． 9
ó $\rho \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu$ à àa入 $\omega \sigma \omega \sigma \iota \nu$
8＇ỏ $\rho \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu$ поィท́бабเข
cis ò $\rho \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu$ п $\quad$ oáyoutas

rò ò $\rho \gamma i \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \grave{j} \delta \dot{v}$
òpyíat

ópyidoc
$\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 1．9；2．10


－ 9.14
ö $\rho \in \xi$ ¢s
$\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 2． 1
Beฑ́vets al ỏpégets
＇Орє́бтŋ $\boldsymbol{\tau}$

今 7.3
－ 24.3
－ 23.8

$\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ ö $\rho \kappa \omega \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \rho a \chi \omega \bar{\omega}$


ŏ rı kai âsıov
\％${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{t} t$

${ }^{\circ}$ and $\mu \dot{\eta}$


oưठ̇̇̀ $\pi \lambda$ 白o
oủk after ầ
ov̉кétィ
จv̉̉a $\sigma \kappa \in \lambda_{\eta}$
oủ resumptive
ou’คaขó $\mu \eta \kappa \in s$
тà èv ó $\phi \theta a \lambda \mu o i ̂$
ó $\psi \grave{\epsilon} \pi a \rho \hat{\rho} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$
$\pi a y i \omega s$
таүкратıабтıко́s
סıà $\pi$ á ${ }^{\circ}$ os
єis $\pi \dot{d} \theta o s \pi \rho o a \chi \theta \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$
a 7． 12 ；vol． 1 App．（C）
a 1．7n； 2.21
ap．$\gamma$ II．13， 15
阝9． 11
ap．$\gamma 7.11$
a 12．5；$\beta 6.18$
$\gamma 1.3$
$\beta 13.2$
a 5.14
a 13.7
a 2.5
$\pi a ́ \theta o s$（various senses of）
$\beta$ 1． $8^{\prime}$

$\beta 17.8$
$\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{̣}$ oìkєị́ $\pi a ́ \theta \in t \quad \beta 8.6$



a 9.15
$\pi a ́ \theta \eta$
$\beta$ 12．2

$\pi a \theta \omega ิ \nu \quad a 2.7$
$\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu \pi u \theta \omega \hat{\nu} \quad$ a 2.5
$\pi a \neq \eta \mu a ́ t \omega \nu \quad \beta$ 22．16＂
$\pi a \forall \eta r ı k \grave{j} \lambda$ égıs $\quad \gamma 7.13$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { тaáv } & \gamma 8.4\end{array}$

$\pi a \delta \delta i ́ a \quad a 8.4$

$\boldsymbol{\pi \epsilon \pi a เ \delta є ข \mu \epsilon ́ v o l ~ - ~ \beta 6 . 1 7 ~}$

ív $\pi$ aldía $\quad \beta 3.12$
mato̊al ail． 4


maı8ia кaì Onpía $\quad \beta 6.23$
па入auवtıkós a 5.14


$\pi$ àvírvpıs $\quad \gamma 3.3 ; 9.7$
пavoûpyou $\quad \beta$ 5．11
$\pi a ́ v \tau \omega \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{~ \pi a ́ v \tau a ~ a ~} 9.4$


$\pi a \rho a \beta o \lambda \dot{\eta} \quad \beta$ 20．2，4
$\begin{array}{ll}\pi а \rho а \gamma \rho a \phi \eta \prime ~ & \gamma 8.6\end{array}$
$\pi а р a ́ 8 є \iota \gamma \mu a \quad$ а 2．8；9，19；$\beta 25.8$


a 2.9
тарадеєíyнатоs хápıン a 5.2
ס̀à mapå̀єíyparos $\quad \beta 25.8$
тарадеі＇үната $\quad a$ 15．26；$\beta 20.1$

a 9.40
$\pi а р а ঠ е с \gamma \mu a ́ т \omega \nu \quad \beta 18.5 ; 26.5$

$\beta 20.2$

a 2． 10
$\pi а \rho а д є \epsilon \gamma \mu a \tau \omega \dot{\sigma} \eta$
$\beta 25.13$
$\pi a p a \delta ı \eta \gamma \epsilon i ̄ \theta \theta a \iota \quad \gamma 16.5$
mapíbo६ov $\quad \beta$ 21．4；$\gamma$ II． 6

| тарсıтоบце́voıs | ®38 |  | ris $\quad \beta 3.16$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| таракатаӨŋ̆кๆ | ¢ 65 |  | ap． $\mathrm{\gamma} 9.6$ |
| таракца̧́¢ıท | $\beta$ 13．1 | HeıOó入asos | $\gamma 10.7$ |
| тара入еіфеı | $\gamma 4.3$ | трıи́pŋs ė̀ Пєıpateí | $\beta 24.3$ |
| тара入ךроิ์ ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | a |  | － 5.18 |
| тара入ía | $\gamma 10.7 c$ | Hetбiotpatos | a 2． 19 |
| тápa入os | $\gamma 10.7 c$ |  | a 2． 1 |
| паралоуi̧єтає $\quad \beta 24.4$ | $\beta 24.4 ; \gamma 7.3$ |  | ap． $\mathrm{\gamma} 3.2$ |
| таралоуц̧ónevos | $\beta 25.10$ | тe入a＇plov какòv ${ }^{\text {a }}$ a | ap．r 7 ． 11 |
| таралоуібагөaь | $\beta 23.3$ |  | motxias a 12.5 |
| тарє入оуібато | a 14．I |  |  |
| тара入оуıб谚 $\quad \beta$ 25．10； | $\beta$ 25．10；$\gamma 124$ |  | a 11.12 |
| таралоуıбтıко́s a9．29； | a 9．29；$\beta 24.3$ | Hevocús | B23．9 |
| тараขеv́ovat | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 5.4$ | тévta ${ }^{\text {dios }}$ | a 5． 14 |
| тара́тау ¢̇тєра | $\beta 1.4$ |  | a 5．11 |
| тà таратетоıךлéva | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 11.6$ | $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \sigma \nu \rho i \gamma \gamma \varphi$ ขóб¢ | $\gamma$ 10．7f |
|  | $\beta 22.17$ |  | $\beta$ 23． 11 |
| тaparkevá̧̧ ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ， | $2 \beta$ 11．1 | $\boldsymbol{\pi} \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho a \sigma \mu$ évov | a 2． 17 |
| тарабкеvá§ovбı тоьои́rovs | ט̛́rovs $\quad \beta 3.17$ | $\boldsymbol{\pi \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho a ́ v \theta a ı ~} \quad \boldsymbol{\gamma} 8$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 8.2$ ； 9.3 |
| крıràs тoıov́rovs тарабкєváбŋ刀 | рaбкeváon ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 9．16 | $\pi є \rho a i v e t a \iota$ | $\gamma 8.3$ |
| тарабкєขабӨิิбьข | $\beta$ 10．11 |  | a 12.24 |
|  | pòs $\beta$ aбı入̇́áa $\beta 20.3$ | $\pi$ тépas $=$ тéккцар | a 2． 17 |
|  | arpóv $\quad a 15.12$ | $\pi \epsilon \rho i$（redundant use）a | a 15．1， 27 |
| паратทрєір | 阝6．20 | $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\tau} \tau \hat{\nu} \nu$ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$（for $\tau$ à $\left.{ }^{\text {ä }} \lambda \lambda \lambda a\right)$ | ä $\lambda \lambda$ a）a 9.14 |
| таратпреìv тò $\mu$ érpıov | ov $\quad \gamma^{2.15}$ |  | civ a2．1 |
| ларафиés | a 2.7 |  | a 15.13 |
|  |  | $\pi є \rho$ ¢үрáфоутаs | $\beta$ 22． 11 |
|  | $\gamma 14.9$ | тєрієруоs a 4．8，10； 10.9 | ；10．9；$\gamma$ 1． 5 |
|  | $\beta 4.21$ |  | $\gamma 12.5$ |
| тарךкцакӧтєs | $\beta 13.1$ |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 5.3$ |
| $\pi а р \grave{\mu} \mu \pi / \sigma \chi$ ¢ ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | $\gamma 33$ |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 5.3$ |
| тapionots $\quad \gamma 9.9$ | $\gamma 9.9 ; 11.10$ |  | 10．7 $7, d$ ；18．1 |
| тароияia $\quad$ a6．23；12， | a 6．23；12．20， 23 |  |  |
| тароцдіая | $a 11.25$ |  | a 6.23 |
|  | $\beta 21.12$ | $\pi \epsilon \rho i o \delta o s$ év кผ́入ots | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.5$ |
|  | pai $\quad \gamma 11.14$ | $\pi ¢$ piodos | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.3$ |
| ai тароєнiat $\mu$ артирía | ia $a^{\text {a }}$ a $\quad 15.14$ |  | a 4.13 |
| жароноішбıs | $\gamma 9.9$ | $\pi \in \rho ⿺ \pi$ ¢́тєLą | a 11.24 |
|  | $\beta$ 5．11 | $\pi \in \rho ⿺ 𠃊 ⿴ 囗 十 \tau$ | $\beta 13.5$ |
|  |  |  | $\beta 15.3$ |
|  | $\beta 6.13$ | тà $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \tau \grave{a}$ a $\quad a 6.2$ | a 6.28 ； 9.25 |
|  | － 3.16 | $\pi є \rho i \tau \tau \omega \mu a$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 3.4$ |
| тará̧aı | a 13.9 | $\pi \epsilon ¢ \rho \sigma a ь$ | $\gamma 11.6$ |
| $\pi a \tau a ́ \xi \eta \eta$ | a 13.4 | tis ópyウ̀v neveî̀ ap | ap．$\beta$ 23． 1 |
|  | ̇̇̇пárá̧，$\quad$ I 15.29 | тeтteias | a 11.15 |
| тarpa入oías | － 9.4 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.4$ |
| Па́троклоs | a 3.6 | тı̧́́ovta | a 5.12 |
|  | ap．\％2． 14 |  | a．2． 11 |

тù $\pi ィ \theta a \nu u ́ \nu$
$\pi เ \theta a \nu \omega \bar{\nu} \lambda \dot{o} \gamma \omega \nu \nu \rho \bar{\gamma} \sigma \iota s$
$\pi$ ı $\theta$ avồ тò $\pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu a$

тıкро̀s
Mivoapos
$\pi เ \sigma \tau \epsilon i \in \sigma \theta a \iota$
тибтєutıरòs
mítis
$\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s$ ảnóócţis тts
тígтєıs koшаі

тїтєєıs àтодєєктıкàs
$\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \nu$ ä $\tau \epsilon \chi \nu \omega \nu \epsilon \notin 8 \eta$


tàs $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \epsilon s \phi^{\phi} \rho \in \epsilon$

rıбтòs（ $\lambda$ óyos）
$\pi$ เбтต́ュата
Hir $\theta \in \dot{\text { vis }}$
Hıtтakós
$\pi \lambda a \nu a ̂ \nu$
$\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda a ́ \sigma \theta a \iota \gamma 8.1$ ；$\quad \pi \in \pi \lambda a \sigma \mu \in ́ \nu \omega s{ }^{2} \gamma 2.4$
$\boldsymbol{\pi}$ 入atтoцívos
$\Pi \lambda a ̈ \tau \omega \nu$

плєоуєктєîข a 4.9 ；$\beta$ 16．5；17．5n；25． 10
$\pi \lambda \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu($（＇only＇）
é $\nu \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \iota$
$\pi \lambda \eta \sigma a \sigma \mu \mu^{\prime} s$

Toùs $\pi \lambda \eta \eta^{\circ} \sigma$ ov

$\pi \lambda$ оûtos oion tı $\mu \eta$ tis
$\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ оítou $\mu \dot{\rho} \rho \eta$

$\pi \lambda \omega \tau \eta \dot{\rho} \omega \nu$
$\pi \nu$ ยvotiầ
$\pi \nu i \gamma \mu a$

тоєєิ้（of poems）
ó $\pi 0 \downarrow \eta \tau \eta \eta_{s}$（Homer）a 7．31，33；


$\pi \in \pi о i ́ \eta \tau a \iota$

$\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\imath} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\iota}$
$\beta 1.2$
a 15.17
$\beta$ 12．6； 25.7
$\boldsymbol{\beta}^{2} 27$
a 15.15
r4． 3
－ 3.16
$\gamma 1.3$
$\beta$ 18．1
$\gamma 7.4$
$\gamma 11.12$ a 10.4
B24． 2
$\gamma$ 17． 3
a 12.19
a 14．5；$\gamma 13.4$
a I．II
$\beta$ 20． 1
a 1.3
Y 17.1
a 15.1
a 2.2
a 2.3
a 8． 1

B23．22
$\gamma 14.1$
a 1．14；12．10
－ 3.12
B 5.2
a 5．17；
a 11.22
a 6.11
－ 16.1
a 5.7
$\beta$ 16． 1
$\beta 20.4$
a 2.18
$\gamma 10.76$
$\beta 23$ p． 242 n $^{1}$
र 2.14
－3． 16
$\gamma 1.9$
$\gamma 2.5$
$\gamma 2.7$

тоィๆт兀кі́у
B 3.26
èv roîs $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{~ \pi o เ \eta \tau \iota к \hat{s}} \quad \gamma$ 1．13； 2.7 ；

（ $\tau \in \theta \epsilon \omega \dot{\rho} \eta \tau a u$ ）
$\gamma 2.5$
топптік门 $\quad$ a 11.23
тà $\pi о ı \eta \tau \iota k a ̀ ~ \tau \rho \iota \chi$ ©िs ，a 6.3
топŋтькаі каї $\pi \rho а к т ь к а i ́ \quad a 6.6$
поккìos $\gamma 16.2$



$\gamma$ I． 1

тoîs $\pi$ o $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ iots $\quad a 13.9$
тодıтєíat тétтарєs a 8.3


$\pi \quad$ a $\quad$ a 2.7

$\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \iota к o i ̀ ~ a ̈ \gamma \omega े \nu e s ~ \gamma 1.4 ~$

roîs по入ıтıкоîs a 8.7
$\pi o \lambda \lambda a ̀$ кal ỏ入íya кaì èv $\quad \gamma 5.6$
По入úevктоs $\quad \gamma$ 10．7f
по入v́धvpor ap． 6.4
Пoגvкрárŋs єis rò̀s $\mu$ v̂s $\quad \beta 24.6$
Пoגvкрátovs cis Өpacißov入ov $\quad \beta 24.3$
$\pi 0 \lambda v \pi \rho o ́ \sigma \omega \pi \pi \nu$ oủpavóv ap． $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 3.1$
тодитєкvia a 5.5
$\pi 0 \lambda \nu \phi_{i} \lambda_{i} \quad a 5.4,16$
$\pi 0 \lambda v ́ \phi \iota \lambda o s \quad a 5.16$
тo入úxous $\quad \gamma 17.14$
то入ихроขьळ́тєроя $\quad$ a 7.26



$\pi \epsilon \pi \dot{\nu} \eta \tau=a \quad a 6.22$
ànò $\pi$ ovplias $\quad a \quad 13.16$


торıбтаі $\gamma 2.10$
$\pi \in \pi$ úplatal a 2.2
$\boldsymbol{\pi}$ ópot $\quad$ a 4．7，8
$\pi \dot{\rho} \rho \rho \omega \theta \in \nu \quad \beta$ 22．3
（rótos）ék rồ побахш̂s $\quad \beta 23.9$
＇$\pi$ ótva $\sigma \nu \kappa \hat{\eta}\rangle \quad \gamma 7.2$



трактıкоі
$\dot{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \pi \rho \dot{\beta}{ }^{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \omega \nu$
$\pi \rho \hat{o}$ о
тра́шs
траórทs
трайvєб $\theta a \boldsymbol{a}$
т $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ ávขgıs（def．）
т $\rho a \ddot{\nu} \boldsymbol{\tau}$ ıка́
$\pi \rho a \chi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a t \ldots \pi \epsilon \pi \rho \hat{\chi}_{\chi} \theta a t \ldots \pi \rho a \chi \theta \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \theta \theta a \iota$
a 3.8
тò $\pi \rho$ е́ $\pi \mathbf{~ \nu}$

$\pi \rho є \sigma \beta \dot{т} \epsilon \rho о \iota$
тріро七я ӧ $\boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$
$\pi \rho \grave{\text { ё }}$ руои
троауауєiv
троаьрєîтая
тà троаяретá
троаьрои́ $\boldsymbol{\epsilon \nu} \mathbf{\nu}$

какà
a 6． $\mathrm{26}^{n}$
троаірєбเs $\quad$ а 1．14；9．32；$\gamma 16.8$
$\pi \rho o a i \rho \epsilon \sigma เ \nu ~ \sigma \cup \nu \delta ̊ \eta \lambda o u ̄ \nu$
ката̀ тウ̀̀ $\pi \rho о а і р є \sigma \iota \nu$
$\pi \rho о a i \rho \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu . . . \pi \rho a ̂ \xi ̆ \iota$

ล̀mò $\pi \rho \circ a \imath \rho \in ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega s$
т $\quad$ oavakıveì
$\pi \rho o a \nu \epsilon \lambda \omega \nu$
$\pi \rho o a v \lambda \epsilon i ̃ v, \pi \rho o a u ̃ \lambda \iota o \nu$

$\pi \rho o ́ \beta$ оид o七
$\pi р о \delta \in \delta ̊=\xi a ́ \sigma \theta a \iota$
$\pi \rho о \delta \_a \beta \epsilon \beta \lambda \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o \nu$
тродıакє $\chi \omega \rho \eta \kappa$ о́тєs
тродıаби́ $о \nu т а$
$\pi р о 8 \iota \eta \eta^{\gamma} \eta \sigma เ ร$
Про́дıкоя
$\pi р о є \gamma \nu \omega ิ \sigma \theta a \iota$
$\pi$ поєо́ріаи
троєіка̧́ovtєs

троєлоне́vov
$\pi \rho о є \mu \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$
$\pi \rho \nu \epsilon \xi a \gamma \kappa \omega \nu i \sigma a s$
$\pi \rho o \epsilon \xi a \pi a \tau a ̂ \nu$
$\pi \rho о \epsilon \pi \iota \pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \tau \epsilon \nu$
$\gamma 1.1$
a12．2；$\beta$ 13．13
a 7.13
－3．1，12，13；5．11
－ 3.1
－3． $1,17^{n}$ － 3.1
－ 3.2
F3．10
$\gamma 2.3 ; 7.1$
$\gamma 2.1$
$\gamma^{2} 2.1$
$\beta$ 13． 1
r 4.3
a 4．3， 6
a 1.14
－23． 26
a 6.26
a 10.3
－ 21.14
a I． 14
a 13.17
a 13.10
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 16.9$
$\gamma$ 14． 11
$\gamma 17.14$
$\gamma 14$ ． 1
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 13.2$
$\gamma 18.6$
a 2.4
－23．24；$\gamma 17.15$
a 12.29
$\gamma 17.14$ $\gamma 13.5$
a 5．10；$\gamma 14.9$
－ 21.5
a 5.9
a 3.4
－ 21.7
a 13.7
$\gamma 5.7$
$\gamma 5.2 \pi \rho о \sigma \kappa v \nu \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \in s$

$\boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathbf{I I} 6 \quad \pi \rho o \sigma o ́ \delta o v s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} s \pi o ̈ \lambda \epsilon \omega s \quad a 4.8$
$\begin{array}{rlr}\gamma 7.9 & \pi \rho о \sigma о \rho i \zeta \text { оутаи } & \gamma 5.4\end{array}$

ö $\psi \in \pi \rho o \bar{\eta} \lambda \theta \in \nu \quad \gamma 1.5$
$\pi \rho o ́ \theta \epsilon \sigma \iota s \quad \gamma 13.2,3,4$
a 3.5
－19． 26
a 15.29
B 3.15
$\gamma 14.1$
r 9.3
a 14.5
$\gamma 12.3$
$\pi \rho о о$ ठoтоtє

$\beta$ 2．10；13．7

$\gamma 14.11 ; 16.4$

14.1
$\pi \rho о \pi \epsilon \tau \overline{\text { й }} \boldsymbol{a} \gamma \epsilon \epsilon$
r 9.6
 трє́тоута

阝 23.21
$\pi \rho o ̀ s$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.4$

a 9.27
tpòs â rotoû̃ot
a 6.30
$\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ e ̇ v 8 o ́ \xi o v s ~ \sigma o y k \rho i v e l \nu ~$
a 9． 31
$\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ o u ̂ s ~ \zeta ิ َ \sigma t \nu \quad a 12.28$
$\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \hat{̣}$ oíkeíq $\pi a ́ \theta \in t$（absorbed in）
$\beta 8.6$
$\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ к \rho \iota \tau \grave{\eta ̀ \nu}$ тò̀ $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho o ́ v \quad \beta 18.1$

－ 13.9
$\pi \rho$ òs тоиิтo a 3.5
 pova، $\pi \rho$ òs．．．
$\beta 1.8$
тробауорєن்єьข a 2.7
$\pi \rho o \sigma a \iota \tau \in i \nu \quad \beta$ 8．12
$\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \beta 0 \lambda \eta \eta_{\eta} \quad \gamma 2.12$

тробєктนкós（bis）
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 1412$
$\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \xi a \pi a \tau a ̂ \nu \quad \gamma 11.6$
$\pi \rho o \sigma \epsilon \pi \iota \kappa \pi a ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota \tau \iota \mu \grave{\nu} \nu \quad$ a 9.31
$\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \pi \iota \pi \lambda \eta \eta_{\tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu} \quad \gamma 7.9$


$\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \theta \epsilon \sigma t s \quad \gamma 2.12$
a 1.3
a 12.4
a $5.9^{n}$

тробптаíєเข
$\pi \rho о \sigma \pi і \pi т о \nu т а$
$\pi \rho о \sigma \sigma \eta \mu a i \nu \in \iota$ тробтáтає
нápтирєs 8ıттоí，талаєоí，тро́бфатоь

$$
a 15.13,15
$$

то̀ т $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma \tau а т т о ́ \mu е \nu о \nu ~}$
$\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \chi \iota \sigma \mu a$
$\beta$ 23． 18
$\beta$ 19． 10
$\pi \rho о \sigma \chi \rho \hat{\nu \tau а є}$
тротá $\epsilon \iota$ a 2．21，22；3．7；$\beta$ 18． 2

a 2.22
тротáбєєs $\dot{\rho} \eta \tau о \rho и к а i ́ ~$
лротре́тле九 тоьєі̂̀
a 3.7 $\pi \rho о т \rho о \pi \dot{\eta}$
éк троӥжархо́vт $\omega$
ä $\xi ఁ$ т $\frac{\omega}{\nu} \pi \rho \circ u ̈ \pi \eta \mu \gamma \mu \varepsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$
$\pi \rho o v \pi \eta \hat{\eta} \rho \chi{ }^{\epsilon \nu}$
троуто入анßávovtes

－ 23.7
a 3.3
$\gamma 19.2$
a 9．31
a 2.2
今21． 15
a 12.23
трофоßךтикоí
трошסоотоі́ๆке
трош8̊отоí $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ аи
Прштаүópov є́máyүє入иа
прштаүó ${ }^{\text {пи }}$
$\pi т \omega ́ \sigma \in \iota s$ ö $\mu$ оьа
$\pi \tau \omega \sigma \epsilon \omega \nu$ тароноíшб七s
$\pi \tau \omega \chi \in ข ์ \in เ \nu$
$\pi \tau \omega \chi o ́ \mu о v \sigma o s ~ к o ́ \lambda a \xi$
of $\pi \tau \omega \chi{ }^{\text {ó }}$
пиӨayópas
$\pi \nu \kappa \nu \grave{\nu} \nu$ ả $\nu a \pi \nu \in \mathfrak{\imath}$
tuktıkós
тирєтоîs є́X́นєขоя
тบрє́ттєє（bis）
тирíхршv
тบраóтрıх؛
тผิ入os c ใे
a 7．27；$\beta 23.2$
$\gamma 9.9$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.10$
ap．y 3.1
－ 24.7
$\beta$ 23． 1 I
a 2． 18
a 5.14
a 11.10
a 2． 18
ap．$\gamma 3.1$ ap．a 15.13

F 23． 29
y 12.3
a 6.27
a 6.27
тà $\rho$ átura a 10．4，тov̀s $\rho$ aOú $\mu$ ovs a i 12.19 j́a日vías
a I1． 4
páket olkías
ค́ $\ddagger \downarrow$ oía

y II． 13
$\gamma$ I． 3,8
r 11.13

pọ́́̊ıa

a 13.8
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.2$
¢ $\eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu . . . o ̉ \nu o \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { ¢́ } \eta \mu a ́ r \omega \nu & \boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.5 \\ \eta \tau \in ́ o \nu \\ \chi \omega \rho i s & a 6.7\end{array}$
คๆr＜ov Xupis
a 1.14
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { ค́ } \eta \text { торıкòs } & \beta 2.7\end{array}$






a 3．1
 $\delta_{\iota a \lambda \epsilon к т \iota к \hat{\jmath} \text { ．} \quad \text { a } 2.7}$

a 14.5

คo8o8ákтv入os ク̇فs
ap．र 2.13
ค́óma入ov тои̂ ठ́j́rov ap．$\gamma$ 10． 7 C
$\dot{\rho} \boldsymbol{v} \theta \mu o ́ s$ $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 1.4,8.2$
 $\gamma 2.10$

бa入ákøyes $\quad \beta$ 16．2
Ea入apis $\quad a 15.13$
rìv év $\Sigma a \lambda a \mu i ̂ \nu l$ vav $\mu a \chi i a \nu \quad \beta 22.6$

Vápov к入ךpovхías $\quad \beta 6.24$
इámф
$\beta 20.6$
之ánф $\quad a 9.20 ; \beta$ 23．11， 12
тò бафés $\quad \gamma 2.8$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.6$
ap．$\gamma$ II． 13
－ 23.12
$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\mu \nu o ́ s} \quad \boldsymbol{\gamma} 3.3,4$

 рúrךs $\quad \beta 17.4$
бє $\mu$ ขórทs $\quad \beta$ 17．4；$\gamma 8.4$
r 2． 13

tò ék oquciov（tónos）$\quad \beta 24.5$
бๆयeion $\delta^{\circ}$ ötя
סıà $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i \omega \nu$
тầ $\sigma \eta \mu \in \mathfrak{i} 0 \nu$
$\boldsymbol{y} 2.6$
$\beta 25.8$
$\begin{array}{ll}\sigma \eta \mu \in i a i a & a 9.26\end{array}$
$\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i a ~ \lambda \nu \tau \grave{a} \quad$ a 2． 18
тà $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i ̂ a$ тท̂s ảperฑ̂s a 9． 14
àmò oŋncím кaì 入oүíw $\quad \beta$ 5．21


ミŋotós
$\sigma \iota^{\prime} \lambda \varphi \pi a \rho a \lambda \in i ́ \phi \in \omega$
$\Sigma$ ıyeleis
E九ठ̊ךрம́
$\sigma \iota{\text { кías } \pi \rho o \sigma \beta a \lambda \eta{ }^{2} \nu}^{\nu}$

## $\sigma \iota \mu i \tau \eta s$


大ivnts àvฑ́p

बKev́n
okéqus
бксаурафía
Exiph
бкス $\eta \rho$ à óvó $\mu a r a$
бк入ךрà $\mu$ átтєєレ
बKúdıov（on health）
бkomós a 5．1；6．1；

бкvOpんто́s
бкv入єíєเע
бкळ́ $\mu \mu а \tau а$ тарà $\gamma \rho a ́ \mu \mu a$
бкผ́ттоибเข

бó入oıkoı
乏ó入 $\omega \nu$

$\gamma 10.7 d$ बतovə̀
y 18.7
$a p . \gamma 4.3$ ėv ảyopạ oraOท̄vas
a 15.13 бтаӨ̄̄ขas $\chi^{\text {a入койs }}$
а 9.38
－ 23.29

ap．$\gamma 9.9$
$\beta 15.3$
a 4． 12 otevoi
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 23.22$
$\beta 12.26$
ap．y 3． 1
a7．16；$\beta$ 9． $5^{\text { }}$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 6.7$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.7$
a 2.13
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 23.25$
$\beta 10.5$

$\beta 20.5$

$\beta$ 24．5n r $^{n}$ бíxopos $\quad \gamma 11.6$

a 1.10 бтоı $\chi$ €îon каî тótos
$\beta 26.1$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 3.3$ oroıұєia a 2.22

$\beta$ II． 6

a 6． 1
－${ }^{24} 3$
人 5.7 оторуท̀ Appendix（A）vol． 1 p． 292


a 11.27
бофんтìs
a 1．14；$\gamma 2.7$
a 1． 14
a 4.6
$\gamma 2.13$
$\gamma 18.4$
ミoфок入 $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{s}$ O．T．774，$\gamma$ 14．6；Antig．
912，$\gamma$ 16．9；Antig．456，a 13.2
ミoфoк入 $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\mathrm{s}} \quad \gamma$ 17．16
do．（Antig．）
a 15.6
乏oфor $\lambda \bar{\eta} s$（statesman and orator）
a 14． 3 ；$\gamma 15.3$ ； 18.6

סıarpíßovtas $\quad \beta 16.2$
ขо́ $\mu \omega \nu$ бофผ́тєроข $\quad a 15.12$

a 7.14

$\sigma \pi o v \delta i ́ \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$（formation of pass．）


：$\beta 3.7$
a 5.8
117.3

రó $\mu$ еvo a 5．I

a 1． 11
玉т $\alpha^{\beta} \beta a \xi \quad \beta 23.17$
í $\mu$ ウ̀ бтратєvópevos $\quad$ a 13.3

бтре́фе九ン $\quad$ a 15.10
бтрояүилผ́тата $\quad \beta 21.7$
бvyүє́veıa $\quad \beta$ 4． 28
тò $\sigma v \gamma \epsilon \bar{\nu}$ ès $\phi$ Ooveiv $\quad \beta$ IO． 5



$\beta 23.8$

a 11.25
人 2.12


$\sigma \nu \gamma \nu \dot{\mu} \mu \eta s$ тєv́ॄєб日ab $\quad$ a 12.32
оvyүрáццатos $\quad$ 人 56
бvyүрафаì
бvүкатаӨáттєбӨaь

$a p . y 10.7$
a 3． 1
$\gamma 1.5$
a 10.4
a 9.38
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ovropiav
INDEX TO

бบขто́peos
тd̀s бvvrovias $\lambda v \pi \eta \rho a ́ s$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 6.1$


бvбтре́фєıv
бфаирібеıs
бфетєрıбно̀s

бхеฮ่̀̀
$\sigma \chi \in\ulcorner\lambda \iota a \sigma \mu \varphi ิ$
18． 5
a 11.4
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.7$
a $7.27^{n}$
－24．2；$\gamma 18.4$
a 11． 15
a 13． 10
$\gamma 11.16$
a 6． 17 ；$\beta$ 10．4
B 21． 10
$\sigma \chi \eta ิ \mu a$ тท̂s $\lambda e ́ g e \omega s \beta 24.2 ; \gamma 8.1$ ； 10.5
$\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu \Omega \pi 0 \lambda$ เтıкฑ̂s
$\sigma \chi o \lambda \hat{\eta}$
a 2.7
－ 23.4

a 11.24
之心крárךs a 2．11，18；$\beta 4$ ．31； 15.3


入aov
Scokatıkol（ $\lambda$ óyoı）
－ 23.8
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 16.8$
之மкратıка̀
$\beta 20.4$

a 1.3
бผ́นатоs ai $\sigma \chi$ viv
ap．y 3.3

$\beta 5.20$

бఱ́цатоs Xpeía
a 5.10
a． 1.12
бळрєúєเข
$\beta 15.2$
a 4.12
$\beta 5.16$
тà бलтท́pıa
－ 13.13
$\sigma \omega \phi \rho о \nu i k o i$
F 13.13
$\sigma \omega ф \rho о \sigma v ́ \nu \eta$（def．）
a 9.9
бофробvivך кai ảvठ̊pía עє́ov ápetaí a 5．6

тágecos $\beta$ 26． 5 ；
талєเทท์้（ $\lambda \epsilon \in \xi ้ \nu)$
ráĝıs $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 12.6$
талєєขóтๆтоs бŋиєîa
$\gamma 2.1,2$
$\beta 6.10$


ק 3.6
талєเขผิร
тарахท́

ảmò rav̉ro $\mu$ árov
$\tau \in \boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{a} \rho$（etenim）
$\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \omega \rho \eta \mu \in ́ v a$
тє $\theta \eta \gamma \mu$ е́ $\nu 0 \nu$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.3$
$\beta$ 1．2； 9.3
阝 9.3
a 1.2
y 7.11
$\gamma 2.1$

reӨןv入ŋ $\mu$ évov $\quad \gamma 14.4$


тєイи́piov
阝 25.8
тéкцар каі тє́pas таข̉тóv
a 2.17
$\beta 25.14$
ק 21.15
ap．y 3． 1
B 24．2＊
$s$（def．） $\begin{aligned} & \text { a } 7.3\end{aligned}$
a 6.22
a 6．I
a 4． 12
a 7.35
阝 23.3
a 5.9
a 15.13
y 9.6
a 10.12
B12． 11
ק 13.5
a 2.18


ย่ข тథ̣̂ Tєúkpę $\quad \beta$ 23．7； $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 15.9$
Tєvนך $\sigma \sigma 0$ v̂
ข 6.7
тє́ $\chi$ ข $\beta$ ávavoos
a 9.28
тย́Xขą
B 19.8

тย́ $\chi$ ขク…тú $\chi$ п $\quad \beta$ 19．13
тєХขடќтате $\gamma 15.10$
тєХขіิтає
阝 23．5； $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.10$
тєХข0入оуєโิ
a 1.10
$\tau \in \chi \nu 0 \lambda о \gamma \circ$ ิิ $\iota$
a．I．II
т $\omega \nu$ тєХขo入oyoúvtc $\nu$
a 2.4

a 2.5
т $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\lambda i ́ a}$
$\gamma 10.7 a$
テทขロ
ap．y 9.10
rí kal moбòv kal motò
a 7.21
т\＆日évat év énaìve a 3.6
тцम a 5．9；6．13

a 7.30
a 8.4


a 9.30


a 10.17

тинрias тихєì
тò $\tau \iota \mu \omega \rho \in i ̄ \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \mathfrak{\eta} 8 u ́$
тít $\theta$ a
тò $\mu$ $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu$（supplied）
rò ri in eivau et sim．
èv toooútots katpoîs
rouav̂тa
то́коь è̇тítpıroı
tóvots
тóvø
ó тотькós
фаขеро̀̀ ék тต̂̀ топเкผ̂̀

è̀ toîs roтuкoîs è $\lambda$ éyo $\mu \in \nu$
каAáтєр каі̆ é̀ тоі̂s тотькоîs
a 12.18
a 11.9
a II． 13
ap．$\gamma 4.3$
a 7.12
a $7.7 \mathrm{n}^{1}$
ß 4.5
a 5.6
ap．$\gamma 10.7$
$\gamma$ 1． 4
$\gamma 12.4$
－ 22.13
a 2.9
$\gamma 18.5$
a 1.12
a 2.22
èv toîs tortkoîs $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 22．10；23．9，13；
25．3； 26.4

$\beta$ 22．13； 26.1


B 22.13
то́тои a $2.22 ; 5.9$ ；3．17；22．1
то́ттоı дıадектькоі

трауıкóv
траүıкоі̀


тро́тоя

трофаі ঠпно́бсаи
ó tpoxaîos
трохєро̀s $\dot{\rho} v \theta \mu o ́ s$
трифєроі
т $\rho$ ขфผิขтєs
ó тúrtт
тираиvís
tupavvióos тè̉os
Túx $\eta$（def．）


àmò túx
סà̀ Túx $\bar{\nu}$
т $\omega$ Oá $\sigma a \iota$
vippi\}etv

vißpívaı
a 2.21
a 11.23 ；$\gamma$ 10． 3
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 3.4$
$y 14.6$
خ1． 3
$\gamma 10.7$
a 12.8
a 4.11
a 5.9
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 8.4$
$\gamma 8.4$
$\beta 16.2$
B 6.9
a 13.3
a 8．4； 12.9
a 8.5
－ 12.2
a 10.13
a 5.17
a 10.12
a 12.14
B4． 13
a 12.26
B 2.5
a 13.9

－6． 13
vißpts
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 2.3$
v̈ $\beta$ pıs $\beta 2.5$（def．）；12．15；23．8；
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.3$

vißpets
a 12.35

vißpıotıká $\beta$ 16，4

$\beta 8.6$



viynaiveı äplotov $\quad \beta$ 21． 5

a 5． 10
viyíila äpıotod סokeí єival a 6．10
vixiєia（def．）a 5．10
ข̛ytetvò $\quad a 2.1 ; \beta 24.3$
viरpòv iòpôta ap．r 3.3

vimápXetv，єival，$\gamma i \gamma \nu \in \sigma \theta a t \quad a 4.9^{n}$



ขireкріроито $\quad \gamma 1.3$
vinevavtial $\quad a 15.26$


ข́repßaiveıl díkala a 14．5

vine $\rho \beta 0 \lambda \eta \eta_{\text {à }} \rho \in \tau \bar{\eta} s$（in good sense）a 9.29
év taîs virepßonaîs wis èv taîs áperais
a 9.29
$\kappa a \theta^{\circ} \dot{\nu} \pi \epsilon \rho \beta \circ \lambda \eta_{\eta}^{\nu}$
a 13.12


ข่тєןєта⿱䒑土ề $\quad \beta 6.8$
ข่тєреvöaumovề $\quad \beta 8.3$
ข̇ாééxov a7．2


$$
\text { a } 7.6
$$


$\boldsymbol{v} \pi \in \rho$ ท́фауо：$\quad \beta$ I6．I

ข่тє甲єхо́ $\mu \in \nu 0 \nu \quad a 7.2$
ن́meคохウे à $\rho \in \tau \bar{\eta} s \quad a 9.25$
ขंтєрохウ̀ $\pi \lambda \epsilon$ tóv凶ข $\quad$ a 7.31

$\nu \in \omega \sigma \boldsymbol{i}$
$\nu \in \omega \sigma r i ̀ \pi \lambda$ गutov̂ytes
ขท́тьos ös татє́pa ктєivas тaîठas ката－入єimet
$\nu i \kappa \eta$, ขiтє $\rho \circ \chi$ ท́ тเs
ขо $\mu i \sigma \mu$ атоs $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta}$ Oos
 $\nu 0 \mu о$ $\in \boldsymbol{\sigma i}$ ias


（ $\nu$ ó $\mu$ оs）évavtios
éré $\theta \eta$ ó $\nu$ ó $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ os
ó koıvòs עópos
тà $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{o} \nu \nu$ vó $\mu o \nu$

e่ $\nu$ тоis עó $\mu$ ots éctiv
тó入є $\omega \nu$ ßaбi入єîs עó $\mu$ ous
ขобๆนáтıoข
ข $0 \sigma \omega \hat{\text { ones }}$


ข้ขのтá乌૯เข

Evıxóv

$\xi \in \nu เ \kappa \eta \dot{\nu} \nu . . . \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \lambda \in ́ \xi ้ \nu$

گ́є́vos（homonym）

Эєעофávฑs＇E入єárats


گuvòs＇Eyvá入ıos

óठomotê̂ข a 1．2；$\gamma$ 12．3

óduvขpòs
ôèvpтıкоí

＇Oo̊̀uสのยข̀s
U゙ちゃ

oikeiov oै $\nu \mathrm{o}$ 人a
olkeiov ópos
Diкeíots рiкєєótєfoy
$\gamma 14.10$
$\beta 15.3$
a 15.21
a 15.8
a 15． 11
a $15.4,6$
阝6．23
a 13.11
a 4.12
ap．ү 3.3
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.15$
今 24.3
a 6.2
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.6$
$\gamma 2.8$
$\gamma 3.3$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.3$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 11.8$
$\beta 23.18$
$\beta 23.27$
$\beta 20.3$
$a 15.14$
ap．$\beta 2$ I． 11
（14．1

ק 8.8

$$
\beta 13.15
$$

$\beta 3.16$
ap．$\gamma 13.5$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.4$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.6$
$a 5.7$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.6$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.13$
oiketótทs
B4． 28
oiov（scilicet）
$\beta$ 19．26； $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ I． 4
－oiov ผs（pleonastic）$\beta$ 23．3，6 ờa $\mu \eta \delta^{\circ}$ ầ $\in$ is $\quad a 12.6$
ó ẻv т＠̣̂ Oiveí $\pi$ pó入oyos，$\quad \gamma 16.8$
тov̀s oŭvous toùs $\mu \in \mu \iota \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu$ оиs $\quad \gamma 2.4$
$\beta 12.8$
－ 132.
ỗovtal

ỏ入เуархías тє́入os a 8.5
${ }^{\text {ỏ } \lambda \iota y o \phi i \lambda i a ~} \quad \beta 8.10$
${ }^{\text {ỏ } \lambda \iota \gamma о х \rho о \nu เ \omega ́ т є \rho o s ~} \quad$ a 7.26


ỏ入íyшpot
$\beta_{5}$ 5． 14
＇O入v́ $\mu \pi เ a$ vevík $\quad$ a 2.10
iv т $\hat{\varphi}{ }^{\prime} O \lambda \nu \mu \pi \iota \kappa \hat{\varphi} \quad \gamma 14.2$

${ }^{\circ} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \omega \boldsymbol{\gamma} \quad \beta 2.20$
${ }^{\circ}$ Orпpos $\quad a 11.9 ; 15.13 ; \gamma 11.2$
тро̀ ỏ $\mu \mu$ а́тєข тоєєîข $\quad \beta 8.14 ; \gamma 2.13$
тро̀ o’ $\mu \mu$ а́тьข $\quad \gamma 10.6,7 g, i, k, l, n$
$\boldsymbol{\pi \rho o ̀ ~ o ̀ ~} \mu \mu a ́ r \omega \nu$（def．）$\gamma$ II． 2
о̊ $\mu$ оує $\omega \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \gamma 4.4$
$\dot{\delta} \mu 0 \in \theta \nu \in i$ is $\quad \beta 6.12$
$\tau \hat{\nu} \nu \dot{\delta} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \iota \delta \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \gamma 2.12$
тò ö örotov $\quad \beta 19.2$
ö $\mu$ оtov $\theta \in \omega \rho \in$ ì $\quad \gamma$ II． 5
тò ö $\mu$ otov ópầ $\quad \beta 20.7$
8ià rov̂ ópoiov $\quad \beta \quad \begin{array}{ll}25.8\end{array}$
ó $\mu \circ i \omega \nu$ пт $\omega \in \omega \nu$ 人 7.27
à $\pi \grave{̀}$ т $\omega \nu$ ó $\mu$ oí $\omega \nu$ тà ö $\mu$ гиa $\quad$ 4． 9



ó $\boldsymbol{\text { oí } \omega \mu a} \quad$ a 2.7

тapà тท̀̀ $\dot{\delta} \mu \omega \nu \nu \mu i ́ a \nu \quad \beta 242$

| $\delta \mu \omega \nu \mu \boldsymbol{i a t}$ | $\gamma 2.7$ |
| :--- | :--- |


ó $\mu$ одоуov́ $\mu є \nu 0 s$ a 13.9 （bis）；15．18；15．21
тоѝs ó $\mu \mathrm{o} \mathrm{\lambda o} \mathrm{\gamma ov̂} \mathrm{\nu таs} \mathrm{8ıкаíws} \mathrm{ко} \mathrm{\lambda á} \mathrm{\zeta є} \mathrm{\sigma} \mathrm{\theta a} \mathrm{\iota}$
B3． 5

$\boldsymbol{\beta}^{4}$ ． 16
－ 23.29
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 1.8$

 $\dot{\eta} \tau \hat{\tau} \nu \dot{\nu} \nu \boldsymbol{\rho} \boldsymbol{a} \boldsymbol{\tau} \omega \nu(\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \eta)$
סıллоîs óvónaбt
$\dot{\partial} \xi \in i \underline{a}(\phi \omega \nu \hat{\eta})$

ógú̇vuos
ธ́тотєроуоиิข
ó $\rho a ̂ \sigma \theta a l$ ảrvxoû̀rєs a 10．4；$\beta$ 5．11；12．4
－$\beta 6.24$
öрүท̀ a 1．4；$\beta$ 2．1（def．）；2．26； $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 19.3$
$\pi \in \rho i ̀ ~ o ̈ \rho \gamma \eta ̄ s$
ö $\rho \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu \boldsymbol{a} \nu \alpha \lambda \omega \dot{\sigma} \omega \sigma \iota \nu$

cis ò $\rho \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu$ т $\quad$ роáyovtas
тav́e九 òpyท̀̀ ó $\chi$ рóvos

ópyioas

ópyidoc
$\beta$ 1．9； 2.10

F 2.27

ö $\rho$ e $\xi$ เs
$\beta 2.1$




$\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{0}$ ö $\kappa \kappa \omega \nu$ тєтрахшิs


ó tı kaìäફıov
\％̊т

ov and $\mu \grave{\eta}$


oủdè̀ $\pi \lambda$ éo $\nu$
ov̉k after ä̀
ov̉кย́ть
ov̀ $\lambda a \operatorname{\sigma K} \bar{\lambda}_{\eta}$
oừ resumptive

$\tau$ tà èv ó $\phi \theta a \lambda \mu o i ́ s$
ò $\psi e ̀ ~ \pi a \rho \eta ̂ \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$
$\pi a \gamma^{\prime} \omega \mathrm{s}$
a 7．12；vol．I App．（C）
a 1．7n；2．21
ap．$\gamma$ 11．13， 15
B9． 11
ap．Y 7． 11
a 12．5；$\beta$ 6． 18
$\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 1． 3

таүкратıабтıкós
$\beta 13.2$
8ıà $\pi$ á $\theta_{o s}$
єis $\pi \dot{\theta} \theta o s \pi \rho o a \chi \theta \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$
$\gamma 2.5$
$\gamma 2.2$
－ 2.26
$\gamma 2.5$
$\gamma 1.4$

$$
\beta_{5.11 ; 12.5}
$$

a 3.3
a 6.3

阝 1.9
F 3.13
－3． 11
a． 1.5
－3． 13
a 11.9
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 14.7$
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 7.3$
－ 24.3
－ 23.8
a 15.27
a 15.27
－ 19.23
a 11.5
a 5.7
a 15.28
－ 23.20
B 6.4
$\beta 21.15$
－ 21.15
a 2.13
a 5.14
a 13.7
a 2.5

| $\pi a ́ \theta o s$（various senses of） | ses of）$\quad \beta$ 1．8 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| тáOos поเヒív | $\beta 17.8$ |
|  |  |
| $\pi a ́ \theta \eta \tau \hat{\tau} s \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s$ | a 1.4 |
|  |  |
|  | a 9.15 |
| $\pi \dot{A} \dot{\theta}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ | $\beta 12.2$ |
|  | руeтat $\quad \beta$ 11．7 |
| та日へิ้ | a 2.7 |
| $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\tau} \tau \hat{\nu} \boldsymbol{\pi} \alpha \hat{\theta} \hat{\nu}$ | a 2.5 |
| таӨпна́ть⿱亠䒑 | $\beta$ 22．16＂ |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.13$ |
| rauád | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 8.4$ |
| macâvos 8ivo cilò | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 8.6$ |
| таибеía | a 8.4 |
|  | － 12.16 |
| $\pi \in \pi a \iota \delta \in \nu \mu \in ̇ \nu о \iota$ | 阝6． 17 |
|  | a 11.29 |
| ìv $\pi$ aıסía | －3．12 |
| mat8ıal | a 11.4 |
| тàs $\pi$ aıôàs ${ }^{\text {jobeias }}$ | a 11.15 |
|  | tás a 11.15 |
| naı8ia kai Oךpía | 阝 6.23 |
| талaıбтıкós | a 5．14 |
|  | $\beta 23.21$ |
|  | lovpyòs ap．r3．3 |
| паvทirvpıs | ү 3．3；9．7 |
| таขov̂pyo | $\beta 5.11$ |
| пávrøv пє¢ì пávтa | a 9.4 |
|  | a II． 24 |
| тараßá入入єıข про̀s ä入入ous | lous a $\quad$ 9．39 |
| тараßо入ウ | $\beta$ 20．2， 4 |
| тараурафп＇ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 8.6$ |
| тара́ס̇єıүرа $\quad$ a 2．8；9， | 8；9，19；$\beta 25.8$ |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | a 2.9 |
| тараঠ̈єíymatos $\chi$ ápıу | $\nu \quad a 5.2$ |
|  | $\beta 25.8$ |
| таравеі＇¢рата а 15.2 | a 15．26；$\beta$ 20．1 |
|  |  |
|  | a 9.40 |
|  | $\beta 18.5$ ； 26.5 |
|  | 8ío $\quad \beta 20.2$ |
|  | चropeial a 2．10 |
|  | $\beta 25.13$ |
|  | $\gamma 16.5$ |
| rapádogov ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 21 | $\beta 21.4 ; \gamma 11.6$ |

$\beta 17.8$
B 8.6
a 1.4
a a．I
a 9.15
$\beta 12.2$
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 11.7$
a 2.7
a 2.5
$\gamma 7.13$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 8.4$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 8.6$
a 8.4
$\beta 12.16$
B6． 17
a 11.29
－ 3.12
aII． 4
a II． 15
a 11.15
$\pi$ naıסía кai Onpía $\quad \beta 6.23$
палatбтıкós $\quad a 5.14$
Панфìov тé $\chi$ ข $\quad \beta 23.21$

ravท́rvpıs $\quad$ Ү 3．3；9．7
тavoûpyou $\quad \beta 5.11$
$\pi a ́ v t \omega \nu$ пєрì пávтa a 9.4

$\pi а \rho а \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu \pi \rho o ̀ s$ ä入入ous a 9.39
rapror $\quad \beta$ 20．2， 4
тара́ס́єєүна $\quad$ а 2．8；9，19；$\beta 25.8$



$$
\text { a } 2.9
$$

$$
a 5.2
$$

－ 25.8

$$
\text { a } 9.40
$$


阝 20.2
a 2． 10
阝 25.13
$\gamma 16.5$
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| тарсıточие́voıs |
| :---: |
| таракатаӨŋ́кп |
| таракра́¢єєข |
|  |
| $\pi а р а \lambda \eta \rho о \hat{\sigma} \iota \nu$ |
| тара入ía |
| тápa入os |
| тгра入оуi̧¢тає |
| тара入оүı\ó $\mu$ ¢ vos |
| тара入оуíбабӨaь |
| тарє入оуíбато |
| $\pi а \rho a \lambda о \gamma เ \sigma \mu o ̀ s$ |
| тара入оүıбтıкós |

тарауєบ่ovбєข
тара́тау є̈тєра
та̀ ларалєпоьךнє́va

тарабкєvá乌єє
тарабкеvá乌ovбt тоьоúтovs
крเтàs тоเои́тоus тaןaбкєváбท

тарабкєvá̧єбӨat трòs $\beta$ абл入є́a $\beta 20.3$

a 15.12
таратпреі̂ข
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 6.20$
таратךреì то̀ $\mu$ е́трıоע
тарафขє́s

$\gamma 14.9$
$\pi а р є \nu о \chi \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \iota$
тарŋкцако́тєя
$\pi a \rho \eta \dot{\mu \pi} \boldsymbol{\tau} \chi{ }^{\epsilon \nu}$
тарí $\omega \omega \sigma \iota$
таролиіа
тароьцía
тароьціає уршцькая
ai тароєцía $\mu \in \tau а ф \rho а і$ í
ai тароьнíaı $\mu а \rho т и р i ́ a ~$
жароноíшбเs
таррŋбьабтькоí

$\beta 6.13$

$\pi a \tau a ́ \xi a \iota$
татáझŋท

тат $\rho a \lambda$ oías
Пáтроклоs

B3 8
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 65$
$\beta$ 25．10；$\gamma 12.4$
a 9．29；$\beta$ 24． 3
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 5.4$
$\beta 1.4$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 11.6$
$\beta 22.17$
2 $\beta$ II． 1
$\beta 3.17$
$\beta 9.16$
$\beta$ 10． 11

र 2． 15
a 2.7
$\beta 4.21$
$\beta$ 13． 1
$\gamma 33$
人9．9；11． 10
a 6．23；12．20， 23
a 11.25
$\beta 21.12$
$\gamma$ II． 14
a 15.14
r 9.9
－ 5.11
－ 3.16
a 13.9
a 13.4
a 15.29
今 9.4
a 3.6
ap．y 2． 14
$\beta$ 13．I HeєOó入aos
$\gamma$ 10． 7 C Heьбíтtpatos
$\gamma 10.76$ теוбтıкो



$\beta$ 25． 10 тєл木＇ptov како̀



B 3． 16
ap．$\gamma 9.6$
$\gamma 10.7 c$
$\beta$ 24． 3
$\beta 5.18$
a 2． 19
a 2． 1
ap．र 3.2
ap．ү 7.11

$$
a 11.12
$$

Hev $\theta$ cús $\quad \beta 23.9$
тévtaO入os a 5.14
a 5． 11
$\gamma 10.7 f$
B 23． 11
a 2.17
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 8.2$ ； 9.3
r 8.3
a 12.24
a 2． 17
a 15．1， 27
a 9． 14
a 2． 1

тєрıурáфоутая
$\beta 22.11$
тєрífyos，a 4．8，10；10．9；ү I． 5

$\pi \in \rho \iota \in ́ \chi о \nu \tau a$ ỏvó $\mu a \tau a \quad \gamma 5.3$
тоís $\pi \in \rho เ \epsilon ́ \chi$ оvбเข $\quad \gamma 5.3$


$\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \mu a ́ \chi \eta$ тоv фаєขó $\mu \in \nu о \nu \quad$ a 6.23
$\pi \epsilon \rho i ́ o \delta o s$ év кผ́入oเs $\quad \gamma 9.5$
$\pi \epsilon$ íoóos $\quad$ ソ 9.3

$\pi \epsilon \rho เ \pi \epsilon ́ т є เ a l \quad$ a II． 24
$\pi \in \rho เ \tau \pi 0 \hat{u} \quad \beta 13.5$

$\beta 15.3$
тà $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \tau \dot{a}$
$\pi \in \rho i \tau \tau \omega \mu a$
a 6．28；9．25
$\pi \epsilon ́ \rho \sigma a \iota$
$\gamma 3.4$
cis ó $\rho \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu \pi \in \sigma \in$ ̂̀
тeтteías
$\gamma 11.6$
ap．$\beta$ 23．I
a II．I 5
$\pi \epsilon ф v к о ́ т \omega s$ 入є́ $\mathfrak{\epsilon \iota \nu}$
y 2.4
$\pi เ$ ย́\}ovta
a 5.12
a 2．II

|  | $\gamma$ I． 3 | тоıŋтıкúv | B 3.26 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 人fots $\quad \beta$ 18．1 |  | 3；2．7； |
| $\pi \iota \theta a \nu o i ̂ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu a ~$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.4$ |  |  |
|  | （eav $\quad \gamma 11.12$ |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.5$ |
| тıкро̀s | a 10.4 | тоıワтıк！ | $a 11.23$ |
| Mivoapos | $\beta 24.2$ |  | a 6.3 |
| $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \mathcal{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \theta a$, | $\gamma 17.3$ | тоиттьаі̆ каї трактькаі | a 6.6 |
| тıбтєutıkòs | a 12．19 | тоикi入os | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 16.2$ |
| тiotis a 14．5； | a 14．5；$\gamma 13.4$ |  | $\beta 1.2$ |
|  | cs ai．11 |  |  |
| тioteis kowai | $\beta$ 20． 1 |  |  |
| ai Tiбтecs ëvtexpov mivov | mívov $\quad a 1.3$ |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 1． 1 |
| тígTєıs àmod́єıктıка̀s | às $\quad \gamma 17.1$ |  | a 4.7 |
| $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \nu$ äтє¢ $\chi^{\nu} \omega \nu$ єï̀ $\eta$ | ¢ $87 \eta$ | тoîs $\pi$ ohemiots | a 13.9 |
|  | \％ıtexpor a 2.2 | то入ıteîaı тétrapes | a 8． 3 |
|  | a 2.3 |  | a 4． 12 |
| tàs $\pi \mathbf{i o t e c t s ~ \phi e ́ \rho e ı l ~}$ | a 8．1 |  | 8． 1 |
|  | rıoraí ciov a 15.21 | по入ıгıкウ | 2． 7 |
| $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ ıбтòs（ ${ }^{\text {ójóos）}}$ | $\beta 1.2$ |  | a 4.5 |
| $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ เซтผ́щата | a 15.17 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 1.4$ |
|  | 阝 23.22 | то入ıтько̀s бט入入оүıбнòs | $\boldsymbol{\beta} 22.4$ |
| пıtrakós $\quad \beta 12.6$ | $\beta$ 12．6； 25.7 | roîs по入ıтıкоîs | a 8.7 |
| $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ，${ }^{\text {âa }}$ | $\gamma 14.1$ |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 5.6$ |
|  |  | По入úevkтos | $\gamma 10.7 f$ |
| $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ аттоиє́vos | － 4.27 | по入v̇tupot | ap． $\mathrm{\gamma} 6.4$ |
|  | a 15.15 | Ho入vкрátŋs єis roùs $\mu$ vis | $\beta 24.6$ |
|  | п入árovos $\quad \gamma 4.3$ | Ho入uкрátous cìs Өрaбißov入ov | ，$\beta 24.3$ |
|  | 16．5；17．5n；25．10 |  | ap．y 3．1 |
| $\pi \lambda \eta \nu$（＇only＇）a 1．14； | a 1．14；12．10 | политекvia | a 5.5 |
|  | －3． 12 | $\pi$ тлифілía | a 5．4， 16 |
| $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma \tau a \sigma \mu o ́ s$ | $\beta 5.2$ | $\pi$ тли́фф入os | a 5.16 |
|  | 阝eidos a 5．17； | modú ${ }^{\text {ous }}$ | $\gamma 17.14$ |
| тoùs $\pi \lambda$ ń $\sigma$ cov | a 11.22 |  | a 7.26 |
|  | ws ab．11 | $\pi \bigcirc \lambda \nu \omega \rho \epsilon i ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota$ | $\beta 2.7$ |
| $\pi \lambda$ oûtos oiov $\tau \iota \mu \eta$ ris | ris $\quad \beta 16.1$ |  | － 25.4 |
| $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ оíтov $\boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \rho \boldsymbol{\eta}$ | a 5.7 |  |  |
|  | $a{ }^{\prime} \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta \quad \beta 16.1$ | $\pi \epsilon \pi$ и́ขๆтая | a 6.22 |
| $\pi \lambda \omega \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \rho \omega \nu$ | $\beta 20.4$ | ànò $\pi$ ovppias | a 13.16 |
| $\pi \nu$ ¢votầ | a 2.18 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.7$ |
| $\pi \nu \hat{\gamma} \mu \mathrm{a}$ | $\gamma 10.76$ | $\pi о \rho \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.10$ |
|  | $\beta 23 \mathrm{p} .242 \mathrm{n}{ }^{\text {l }}$ | торıбтаі | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.10$ |
| moteiv（of poems） |  | $\pi \in \pi$ и́pıбтая | 2.2 |
|  | a 7．31， 33 ；$\beta 3.16$ | $\pi$ о́poı | a 4．7，8 |
|  | \＃ $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ \％$\quad \gamma 1.9$ | $\pi o ́ \rho \rho \omega \theta \in \nu$ | $\beta$ 22． 3 |
|  | ；тeпnípкєข a 9．20； |  | $\beta 23.9$ |
| $\pi \epsilon \pi$ оíraı | －3． 16 | ＇$\pi$ ótvia $\sigma \nu \kappa \bar{\eta}$＇ | $\gamma 7.2$ |
|  | a\％t $\quad \gamma 2.5$ | $\pi \rho а ү \mu а т є$ v́ovtat a 1.3 | 3，9； 2.5 |
| $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\iota} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\iota}$ | $\gamma 2.7$ |  | ov $\beta 26.5$ |




a 10.4 тoint⿺kí a 11.23


тоикinos $\gamma$ 16．2


noloús тıvas ímo入a $\beta$ áveıl toùs $\lambda$ éyouras
$\gamma 1.1$
a 4.7
a 13.9
a 8.3
a 4.12
a． 8.1
a 2.7
a 4.5
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 1.4$
－ 22.4
a． 8.7
$\gamma 5.6$
p．$\gamma 6.4$
ק 24.6
$\beta 24.3$

$\pi$ политекиia a 5.5
$\pi 0 \lambda \nu \phi i \lambda i a \quad a 5.4,16$
толифілоs a 5．16
тo八úxous $\quad \gamma$ 17．14


$\pi о \nu \eta \rho \in \dot{́} \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ èmıтрíт $\omega \nu$ то́ккע ap．$\gamma 10.7$
$\begin{array}{ll}\dot{a} \pi o ̀ ~ \pi o \nu \eta p i a s ~ & a 13.16\end{array}$


торıбтаі $\gamma 2.10$
$\pi \in \pi$ úpıттal a 2.2
$\pi$ о́por $\quad$ a 4．7，8
（тómos）ék тoû тобахผ̄s $\quad \beta 23.9$
＇$\pi$ órvia $\sigma v \kappa \bar{\prime} ’ \quad \gamma 7.2$
$\pi \rho a \gamma \mu a \tau \epsilon \cup \theta \hat{\eta} v a l \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ 入óyò $\beta 26.5$

|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ I． 1 |  | －5．22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| трактıкоі | a 12．2；$\beta$ 13．13 | троєтıко́s | a 9.29 |
|  | a 7.13 | ${ }^{\circ} \boldsymbol{\psi} \boldsymbol{\psi} \in \pi \rho \circ \bar{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 1.5$ |
| $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\rho}$ âo | F3．1，12，13；5．11 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 13．2，3，4 |
| т $\boldsymbol{\text { páas }}$ | F3． 1 | троїеขтая | a 3.5 |
| $\pi \rho a o ́ t \eta s$ | －3．1， $1^{\text {n }}$ | тоокєipevod tèlos | $\beta 19.26$ |
| $\pi \rho a v ̈ \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a u$ | －3． 1 | $\pi \rho \dot{k} \lambda \eta \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ ts | a 15.29 |
| трávขaıs（def．） | －3． 2 |  | －3． 15 |
| траӥrтıка́ | －3．10 | $\pi$ то́лoyos | $\gamma 14.1$ |
|  |  | tpodoeiv | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.3$ |
|  | a 3.8 | ék toovoias | a 14.5 |
| тò $\pi \rho^{\prime \prime} \pi{ }^{\text {a }}$ | r 2．3；7．1 | $\pi \rho о о \delta о \pi о$ оі | $\gamma 12.3$ |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.1$ | трооботоєєїӨat ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | －2．10；13．7 |
|  | $\beta 13.1$ |  | V 14． 11 ； 16.4 |
| $\pi$ тivoos öpoto | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 4.3$ | трооípov a $1.9 ; \gamma 1$ | y 13．3，4；（def．） |
| $\pi \rho$ ¢о $¢$ ¢уоv | a 4．3，6 |  | 14.1 |
| троауауєiv | a I． 14 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.6$ |
| троаьреіттая | ק 23． 26 | （тónos）бкотeì tà $\pi \rho 0 \pi \rho$ ¢́r | тре́лоута каі̆ àmo－ |
|  | a 6.26 | тре́тоута | $\beta$ 23．21 |
| троаьрои́лєขоя | a 10． 3 | $\pi \rho o ̀ s$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.4$ |
| $\pi \rho о а \iota \rho о$ йтая пра́т | тreıv rà roîs éx ${ }^{\text {Opoîs }}$ |  | a 9.27 |
|  | a 6． $26^{n}$ | тpòs à rooûto | a 6． 30 |
| троаіребts | 1． 14 ；9． $32 ; \gamma 16.8$ |  | civ a $\quad$ a．31 |
| $\pi \rho \rho a i \rho \in \sigma \iota \nu$ бvvoj ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 入oûv ${ }^{\text {® } 21.14}$ | $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ o u ̂ s ~ \zeta \omega ̂ \sigma \iota \nu ~$ | a 12． 28 |
|  | at a 1． 14 |  | （absorbed in） |
|  | a $\quad a 13.17$ |  | B8．6 |
| ėv п¢ | ox日̇pía a 13.10 |  | $\nu \quad \beta$ 18．1 |
| àmò троаıрétews | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 16.9$ |  | $\beta 13.9$ |
| троаракıveì | $\gamma$ 14． 11 | $\pi \rho \grave{s}$ тoûto | a 3． 5 |
| $\pi \rho \circ a v e \lambda \omega \nu$ | $\gamma 17.14$ |  | ва入入óvтєs 8ıaфé－ |
| троаv入еiv，троай入ıov | $\nu \quad \gamma 14.1$ | povaı $\pi \rho$ òs．．． | 今 1.8 |
|  | ts $\quad \gamma 13.2$ | $\pi \rho \circ \sigma a \gamma o p \in v ่ \epsilon \iota \nu$ | a 2.7 |
| $\pi \rho o ́ \beta o v \lambda o t$ | $\gamma 18.6$ | тробаıтeiv | $\beta 8.12$ |
|  | a 2.4 | $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \beta 0 \lambda \eta$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.12$ |
|  | $\beta$ 23．24；$\gamma 17.15$ |  | a 10．9；$\gamma 12.6$ |
| $\pi \rho о$ ¢ıакє $\chi \omega \rho \eta$ ¢о́тєs | a 12.29 | тробєктккós（bis） | $\gamma 14.12$ |
|  | $\gamma 17.14$ | $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \xi a \pi a \tau a ̂ \nu$ | $\gamma 11.6$ |
|  | $\gamma 13.5$ |  | a 9.31 |
| Про́8ıкоя | a 5．10；$\gamma 14.9$ |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.9$ |
| $\pi \rho о є \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \theta a t$ | － 21.5 |  |  |
| $\pi \rho о є \delta \rho i a t$ | a 5.9 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma 4 . 1}$ |
| $\pi \rho о є$ ска́Sovtes | a 3.4 | $\pi \rho \circ \underline{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ ts | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.12$ |
| троєıтóขта е́тєєтєi้ | $\beta 21.7$ |  | a 1． 3 |
| троє入оре́vov | a 13.7 | тробката入入áттоутая | a 12.4 |
|  | $\gamma 5.2$ | $\pi \rho о \sigma к \nu \nu \eta \chi^{\prime \prime}$ เs | a $5.9{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
|  | $\gamma$ 14．12 | $\pi$ то́то8̊o | － 22.5 |
| троє¢ататầ | $\gamma 11.6$ |  | а 4.8 |
| $\pi \rho о \epsilon \pi \iota \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \tau \tau \epsilon\llcorner\nu$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.9$ | троборí̧ovta | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 5$. |



| Equtós | $\gamma 10.7 d$ | бтovoì | $\gamma 18.7$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $a p . \gamma 4.3$ | c่v ảyopą ora＠̇̄vaı | a 9． $3^{8}$ |
|  | a 15.13 |  | ap． $\mathrm{\gamma} 9.9$ |
| Eıठ̊ך¢á | $\beta 23.29$ | отáaıца | $\beta 15.3$ |
| бוki＇as $\pi \rho 0 \sigma \beta$ 人 $\lambda^{\prime \prime} \nu$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.12$ | $\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \mu \phi \nu \lambda a$ | $\beta 23.22$ |
|  | a 4.12 | отevoi | $\beta 12.26$ |
|  | $\beta$ 16．2； $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.14$ | àkтウ̀ $\boldsymbol{\text { atcvórtopos }}$ | ap．$\gamma$ 3． 1 |
| бivvis ${ }^{\text {aj} \nu \eta \dot{\rho}}$ | ap．र 3.2 | $\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \eta \sigma \iota s$ a 7 | 6 ；${ }^{\text {9 9．}} 5^{\text {n }}$ |
|  | a 5．14 |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 6.7$ |
| $\sigma K \in ข ́ \eta$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 5.5$ |  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.7$ |
| бKé ${ }^{\text {cks }}$ | a 2．14；4．7 |  | a 2． 13 |
| бкıаурафía | $\gamma 12.5$ | отך入ír $\boldsymbol{\sim}$ | $\beta 23.25$ |
| Exipwl | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 3.2$ | оти̂入at＇Hpak入єîat | $\beta 10.5$ |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.10$ |  | $\beta 20.5$ |
|  | ap．$\gamma 16.4$ | ミזךбíxopos év Mokpois | $\beta 21.8$ |
| okúdıov（on health） | $\beta 24.5{ }^{\text {n }}$ | Erjoíxopos | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 11.6$ |
| бкotós a 5．1；6．1； | okotoí a 9．1 | －TolXeiov | $\beta 22.13$ |
| $\sigma к о \pi \epsilon i ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ a u ́ r \hat{\nu}$ | a 1．10 | 大rolXeî̀ kaì тóntos | $\beta$ 26．1 |
| бкvөрんто́s | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 3.3$ | бroıXeia | a 2.22 |
| бкv入tíclv | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 4.3$ |  |  |
|  | $\beta$ II． 6 |  | a 6． 1 |
| бкผ่лтоибเข | $\beta 2.12$ |  | $\beta$ 24． 3 |
| бo入otki̧etv | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 5.7$ | oropyì Appendix（A）vol．I p． 292 |  |
| бó入оıкоь | $\beta 16.2$ |  | $15 ; \gamma 10.6$ |
| 之ó入 $\omega \nu$ | a 15.13 |  |  |
| ท̇ бофía по入入へิ้ каі Өavцабт |  | రónevot a 5． 1 |  |
|  | a 11． 27 |  | a 1．II |
| бофLбTทेs a | $a 1.14 ; \gamma 2.7$ |  | $\beta 23.17$ |
| бафıбтıkòs | a 1． 14 |  | a 13.3 |
| тoîs бoфıбтıkoîs 入óyoıs | a 4.6 | $\sigma \tau \rho \epsilon \beta \lambda$ ós | a 1． 5 |
|  | ov $\gamma 2.13$ | бтре́ $\phi \in ⿺ 辶$ | a 15.10 |
|  | $\nu \quad \gamma 18.4$ | бтроуүv入ผ́тата | $\beta 21.7$ |
| इoфок入ך̂s O．T．774，$\gamma$ I | 14．6；Antig． | бvyүย์vela | ק 4.28 |
| 912，$\gamma$ 16．9；Antig．456 | 6，a 13.2 | тò $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu$ ès $\phi$ Ooveiv | $\beta$ 10． 5 |
| Eoфok入 ${ }^{\text {g }}$ s | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 17.16$ |  |  |
| do．（Antig．） | $a 15.6$ |  | 今 23.8 |
| Eoфok入 $\hat{\eta}_{s}$（statesman and | orator） |  | CII． 25 |
| a 14．3；$\gamma$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 15.3 ; 18.6$ |  | \％ 2.12 |
| roùs $\sigma 0 \phi$ oùs éni rais $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \lambda$ | $\lambda o v \sigma i \omega \nu$ Oípaus |  | a 13.16 |
| 8ıatpißoytas | $\beta 16.2$ | бvy\％v＠ | 今6． 19 |
|  | a 15.12 |  | a 12．32 |
|  | u $\mu$ eí̧av | бvүүрá $\mu$ цатоs | \％ 56 |
|  | a 7.14 | бvy\％paфai | a 2.2 |
|  | at $\quad \beta 2.24$ | оvүкатаӨáттєбӨaı | $a p . \gamma 10.7$ |
|  | of pass．） |  | a 3．1 |
|  | ：$\beta 3.7$ |  | $\gamma 1.5$ |
|  | a 5.8 | бvүкเขסัขขєบ́ovtas | $a 10.4$ |
| бтоvס̇абтıкผ́тє¢оь | $\beta 17.3$ | ovykpivecu | a 9.38 |



## － 12.13

$\gamma$ II． 15
$\beta 24.10$ a 10． 18
a $4^{6 n}$
a 1.12
a 2.13
a 2．8， 9
a 2． 13
a 2.8
фаเขó $\mu \in \nu o s ~ \sigma v \lambda \lambda о у เ \sigma \mu o ̀ s$



a 1.14
ヶ่о入เтเкิิ $\sigma \nu \lambda \lambda о ү เ \sigma \mu \varphi ิ$
－ 22.4


$\sigma \nu \mu \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda е т а \iota ~ \pi о \lambda \lambda a ́$
$\sigma v \mu \beta a \lambda \lambda о \mu \epsilon ́ v \eta \nu \pi \rho o ̀ s$
$\gamma 1.2$
a 2.4
a 2． 1
a 10：9
F 24.6
（то́тоs）ઠ̊̀à тò $\sigma \cup \mu \beta є \beta$ ŋкós
tup乃o入al
$\sigma \nu \mu \beta$ оv入єยัтเко́v
$\sigma \nu \mu \beta o v \lambda \eta{ }^{\prime} s \mu^{\prime} \rho \eta$
$\sigma \nu \mu \beta o v \lambda \in v \in \in t$
бט́mßо入a $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon เ \nu$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 15.9$ ；16． 10
roîs $\sigma u \mu$ ßou入evtıkoîs єïp $\quad$ a 10.19

$\sigma v \mu \pi а \rho а \lambda а \mu \beta a ́ v \in \iota$
$\sigma \nu \mu \pi a \rho a \nu \in \cup ́ є \iota \nu$
боцтєраเขо́цєขоข
F 19.5
a 3.5
y 5.4
$\gamma 18.6$
бvнтє́рабна $\beta 21.2 ; 21.7$ ；$\gamma 18.2,6$（ter） $\sigma \nu \mu \pi є \rho a \sigma \mu a \tau \iota \kappa \omega \hat{s}$
$\beta 24.2$
$\sigma \nu \mu \pi \in \rho \iota \pi a r \in$ ใ̂ข $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.6$
оицлintєเข ảmò rúXทs
т $\sigma \nu \mu \pi \tau \Delta \mu a \tau \alpha$
бчифе́роע
rò $\sigma v \mu \not \subset \in ́ \rho o \nu$（equity）
тои̂ $\mu \hat{\hat{a} \lambda \lambda о \nu ~ \sigma v \mu ф ́ ́ \rho о у т о s ~}$

वuváyєเข a 2．13；$\beta 22.15$ ；
6． 1.32
a6．1； 15.25
a 15．10
a 7． 1
今 12.12
22．3， 4 ；
23． 16
ouváyerau
ovvayตyท́

ouvaktéov
$\sigma v \nu a \lambda \gamma \in i ̂$
$\phi a u ̄ \lambda a \quad \sigma v \nu a \lambda \in i \phi \in \iota \nu$
AR．III．
y 9.8
F 23． 30
a 15.33
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 2.21$ ； 4.3
阝 6.8

бvขaлєрүa̧oцévovs $\quad \beta 8.14$

бvขapıOんоvцévov a7．3
бvváұa！$\gamma$ 14． 1

$\mu \epsilon \dot{̊} \sigma v \nu \delta ̊ \in ́ \sigma \mu o v ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \quad \gamma 6.6$



$\sigma \nu \nu \not ̊ \iota \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \in$ v̂бat $\quad \beta$ 4． 12

бuvơva̧ó $\mu$ evov $\quad a 15.32$
бv́veyrus фaivecoar $\quad \beta 5.1$
rà $\sigma u ́ v \in \gamma y v s$ ผis raủzà a 9.28

бvขє́ $\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu \quad \beta 7.5$

бvレ̇єтралие́vшs $\quad \beta 24.2$
बvขクүорєî̀ $\quad a 14.3 ; \beta 20.6$

$\sigma \nu \nu \eta$ סó $\mu \in$ ขоข $\quad \beta 4.3$
бuvín $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ a 11.15
Tò $\sigma u ̛ v \eta \theta \in s \quad a 10.18$
тò $\sigma u ̛ ́ \eta \eta$ Ocs $\mathfrak{\eta} 8 \dot{v} \quad a$ II． 19
бvขท＇$\theta \in$ เs
a 11． 16
סıà ouví $\in$ ciav a 1.2
бvขךขаүка́бӨクбау $\quad \beta 7.5$
बvvŋ́pŋra؛ a 1.7
テurฑ̂ษav $\gamma$ I4．I
бúv $\theta \in \sigma$ cs a 7．31
ouv $\begin{aligned} \text { グк } & a 13.2\end{aligned}$


лєрi бuvOnкผิข a 15.20
テvע $\lambda$ íßovra a 5.12
テuviôề $\quad \gamma 10.6$
סuvveфeî $\quad \beta 19.24$

7 7.5
биขоно入оуєîข $\quad \beta 20.5$

тà бuvteívoyta
今 2.3
бuvtı日évą a7．3I
テvขrı日éval тє́Xขךข
a 1． 3
$\sigma v \tau_{i} \theta \in \sigma \theta a \varepsilon$
a 15.9

$\beta 24.3$
бuvtı日

бvyropiav

## бvvrópeos

$$
\gamma 6.5,6 ;
$$



बvarpédetv
бфаıрі完ets


$\sigma \chi \in \dot{\text { ò }} \boldsymbol{y}$

## $\sigma \chi \in \tau \lambda \angle a \sigma \mu \hat{\varphi}$

$\gamma 6.1$
；15．10；
18.5

$$
\text { ràs ouvrovias } \lambda u \pi \eta \rho a ́ s
$$

a 11.4
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.7$
a $7.27^{n}$
$\beta$ 24．2；$\gamma 18.4$
a 11.15
a 13.10
$\gamma$ II． 16
a 6． 17 ；$\beta$ 10．4＂
$\beta$ 21． 10

$\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu a \pi 0 \lambda_{\iota \tau}<\kappa \bar{\eta} s$
a 2.7
F 23.4
$\sigma \chi 0 \lambda \eta$
$\sigma \omega ́ \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a l ~ e ́ k ~ \kappa \iota \nu \partial ̀ v i \nu \omega \nu$
Eんkpátทs a 2． 11 ，18；B4．31； 15.3


 $\lambda a o \nu$
－ 23.8
之wкрatıкol（ $\lambda_{\text {óyoı）}}$
ү 16.8
乏 $\omega$ кратıка̀




$\sigma \omega ́ \mu a \tau o s$ रpeía
$\sigma \omega \rho \in$ úe兀ข
$\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a \operatorname{\tau iss} \pi o ̄ \lambda e \omega s$
Tà $\sigma \omega$ rípıa
$\beta 20.4$
a 1.3
ap．y 3.3
$\beta 5.20$
a 5． 10
a 1.12
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 15.2$
a 4.12
－ 5.16
$\sigma \omega \phi \rho о \nu$ ıoi
$\sigma \omega ф \rho o \sigma \dot{\nu} \eta$（def．）



B 25.8
тéкцар каі̀ тépas tav̉róv
a 2.17

$\beta 25.14$
текуотосіа $\beta 21.15$
тe入є $\sigma$ фópov ap．$\gamma 3.1$
Tє $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta} \quad \beta$ 24．2＂

тò тèos àyaOóv ab．22

télos（tandem）a． 4.12
rà èv тénct tov̂ $\beta$ iov a 7.35
тe入ตْขクs $\quad \beta 23.3$
тє $\boldsymbol{e ́ v \eta} \quad$ a 5.9
Tevéórot a 15.13
те́ $\rho \mu a \quad \gamma 9.6$
тетаүнév＠s a 10.12

тยтатєเขติซ日at $\quad \beta 13.5$
те́токеу a 2.18

тà тет та́ $\mu \in \tau \rho a \quad \gamma 1.9$ ；8．4；11．6


Tєv $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma \sigma o \hat{v} \quad$ y 6.7

тéxpal $\quad \beta 19.8$

Té $\chi \nu \eta \ldots$ ．．．̛́X $\quad \beta$ 19．13
тєұขıко́татөя $\quad \gamma 15.10$
rexvítal $\quad$ 日23．5；$\gamma 2.10$
тeXpo入oүề a 1.10
тágecs $\beta$ 26．5；


$$
\begin{array}{rr}
\boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\xi} \xi \iota s & \gamma 12.6 \\
& \gamma 2.1,2
\end{array}
$$

－6． 10


B 3.6
татєเขติร
тарахท́

ànò taủrouárov
$\tau \in \boldsymbol{\gamma a ̀} \rho($ etenim）
$\tau \in \theta \in \omega \rho \eta \mu e ́ v a$
$\tau \in \theta_{\eta \gamma \mu}{ }^{2} \nu 0 \nu$
r 7.3
－ 1.2 2；9． 3
B9．3
a 1.2
r7．11
$\gamma 2.1$ тò тар＇Éкáotoss tímon
a 1.11

| $\tau \in \chi$ ขodoyov̂ $\frac{1}{}$ | a 1． 11 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | a 2.4 |

roùs ข̂̂̀ reұขo入oyoûvtas al 2.5
т $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\lambda i a} \quad \gamma 10.7 a$
т $\hat{\eta}$ ขo ap．$\gamma 9.10$
rì кaì пooòv кaì $\pi 0$ ．ò̀ ．a 7.21
rı日évaı èv èmaìv
a 3.6


a 7.30
àmò т т $\mu \eta \mu a ́ r \omega \nu \quad a 8.4$
$\tau \mu \eta \eta_{\epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu} \quad a 14.3$
$\gamma 3.2$ è $\phi$＇ois $\tau \not \mu \omega \overline{\nu \tau a t ~} \quad$ a6．14



тıнорias тихєì
тò $\boldsymbol{\tau} \mu \omega \rho \epsilon i \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \eta i \delta u ́ ~$
тítal
тò $\mu$ év（supplied）
rò ti iju cival et sim．
èv roloúroıs kalpoîs
тouavิтa
то́коь émítpıro七
róvous тóv $\varphi$
ó тотıкós



каӨáтєр каì év тоі̂s тотıкоîs
a 12.18
a II． 9
a 11 I 13
$a p . \gamma 4.3$
a 7.12
a $7.7 \mathrm{n}^{1}$
阝 4.5
a 5.6
$a p . \gamma 10.7$
$\gamma 1.4$
$\gamma 12.4$
－22． 13
a 2.9
$\gamma 18.5$
a 1.12
a 2.22
23．9， 13 ；
25．3； 26.4
то́tos，$\sigma$ то८Хєîo
－22．13；26．1


$\boldsymbol{\beta} 22.13$
то́тои $\quad a 2.22 ; 5.9$ ；3．17；22．1
то́ттоь д̊ıa入ектเкоі̀

трауıко́v
траускоі

тро́таєор
тро́тоя
$\pi \epsilon \rho i$ т $\rho \circ \phi \bar{\eta} s$
трофаі 8 $\eta \mu$ о́бьає
ó tooxaîos

т $\rho$ ифєроі
т $\rho v \phi \omega ิ \nu \tau \epsilon s$
ó тúrtav
a 2.21
a 11．23；$\gamma$ 10． 3
y 3.4
$\gamma 14.6$ ز 1.3
$\gamma 10.7$
a 12.8
a 4.11
a 5.9
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 8.4$
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 8.4$
$\beta$ i6． 2
B 6.9
a 13.3
ai8．4； 12.9
a 8.5
$\beta 12.2$
a 10． 13
a 5.17
at 10.12
a 12.14
F4． 13
a 12.26
阝 2.5
a 13.9

－6． 13
v̋ßpts
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 2.3$
v̈ßpıs $\beta 2.5$（def．）；12．15；23．8；
$\gamma 7.3$

vißpets
a 12.35

vißpıotıká $\beta$ 16．4

$\boldsymbol{\beta} 8.6$



viyuivèv äpıatov $\quad \beta$ 21． 5


$$
\text { a 5. } 10
$$

viyícta ä̉plorov סoкeî cival a 6． 10
viyíia（def．）a 5．10
ưytcivòv a 2．I；$\beta$ 24．3
i̛



ข̇mápXováa фúaıs a II．I

ขiтeкріроито $\quad \gamma 1.3$
vinevavriat $\quad a 15.26$


ข่тeคßaiveır סíкаиа a 14.5
$\boldsymbol{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \beta_{0} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \quad a 6.21$
vire $\rho \beta_{0} \lambda \grave{\eta}$ ảperins（in good sense）a 9.29
év raîs vimepßodaîs wis èv taîs ápetais
a 9.29

$\dot{\nu} \pi \epsilon \rho \beta$ o $\lambda$ aì $\mu$ ṫaфорai $\quad \gamma$ II． 5



ข่тєคє́ $\chi$ оข $\quad a 7.2$


$$
a 7.6
$$








$260$

 $\phi ı \lambda о \mu \eta \dot{\lambda} a$ фı $\lambda$ óveıko
oi фi $\lambda_{\text {óvicko }}$
філotoveîotą
е́к фi入oroфias
фі入órєкуоя

ф८лótıцоs
філо́тгно

філотıцойдтає
\＆ 2.22

філóфıлоя

філохрұнатіа
$\phi \dot{o ́}_{0}$（def．）

$\phi \circ \beta \in \rho \dot{\alpha}$
фовєро́тұтоs

фоıиıкодáктидos
фоเтติ้

фо́p $\mu>\boldsymbol{\gamma} \xi$ ä $\chi$ орסos
форио̀s
фортькós

今21．15
$\tau i \phi \rho o ц \mu i a \zeta \eta ;$

ol фpóvıцои
$\phi \nu \lambda a к \eta \dot{\prime}$
фu入axìv airet

фидактпрíav
фидактıкós
фu入átroutes
фи́бєı


кãà $\phi$ v́r兀v léval

ठià фúaıv
$\phi$ óres（the true nature）
 фикє
－23． 11
r 3.4
－ 4.12
a 6．30；10．4；11．14； － 12.6
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.8$
－ 20.7
a 11． 26
a 6.30
B9． 14
－ 10.3
B．2． 13

Xaßpias
a7．13；$\gamma 10.7 l$
Xaupímes
$\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 23．29； $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 1226$
т̀̀ $\chi$ алепо̀у ópí̧erau a 6.27
$\chi^{a \lambda \epsilon \pi}{ }^{\boldsymbol{c}} \mathrm{s}$
Xápys
$\boldsymbol{\gamma 4 . 3 ; 1 4 . 1 4 n ^ { 1 }}$
$a 15.15 ; \gamma 10.7 a$
Xapiónuos $\quad \beta 23.17$
$\chi$ Xápıข vixoupyeì $\quad \beta 7.2$

xápıs（def．）
B7．2；4． 29

кеұарьб $\boldsymbol{\text { évous }}$
F 3.17

Xápшуa тòv тéxто⿱亠䒑 $\quad \gamma$ 17． 16

$\mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{i} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \omega \nu$
$\beta$ 23． 11
тò X 人 $\lambda$ ف́veloy
$\beta$ 12． 14



a 5．17 $\chi^{\lambda \text { еєuartai }} \quad \beta$ 3．9；6．20

$\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ II．II Xoヶpinos $\gamma 14.4$

$\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota \ldots \kappa \in \kappa т \tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$
a 4.4
кє $\chi \rho \eta \mu \in ́ v o s$（consulting an oracle）
$\beta 23.12$

$\begin{array}{lll}a \text { 9．13；} \beta \text { 1．} 5 & \chi \rho \eta \sigma т о \eta \theta \eta s & \beta 21.16 \\ a 7.21 & \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau о ф i \lambda i a & a 5.4 .16\end{array}$

a 2． 19 кeरpoveкóres $\quad \beta 3.13$
a4．7，10 xpovlotéon $\gamma 17.2$
a4． 10 रpóvot a 3．4；7．32
a 12．19；$\beta$ 4． 17 （tónos）ék tô̂ tò̀ גpóvov бкотеì $\beta 23.6$
$\boldsymbol{a} 15.21$ хроротрıßєір

$$
\gamma 3.3
$$


ap．$\gamma 2.15$
$\tau \omega ิ \nu \chi$ viठ̀ $\nu$
） 93

 $\gamma 17.15$



$\psi ' \hat{\prime} \in \iota$
$\gamma 2.10$
－23． 1

| рıิิ | a 15.17 |  | a 2.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| oi 廿ev8onaptupoûrtes | $a 14.6$ | ws | r 1．5；3．3 |
| 廿ı入ol 入ójoı | $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 2．3， 6 | ws aieì ròv ópoiov | ap．a 11.25 |
| 廿óyos | a 3.3 | ws àv $\boldsymbol{e l}$ | a 7.28 |
| 廿ódos | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.13$ | 凶s àm入ôs cineiv | a 1．12；5．2； |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 3.3$ |  | B9．8；18．I |
| $\psi \sim \chi$ ¢̀ поía кıท＇бıs | 阝 23．13 | cs cirety artass | a I． 11 |
| тà $\psi$ uxpà | r 3．1， 3 | ws cincè | a 2．I |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \gamma 3.3 \\ & \gamma 3.4\end{aligned}$ |  j̈os | $\text { a } 2.4$ |
|  | $\underset{\epsilon \sigma \theta a t}{\gamma 3.4}$ |  | a 2.14 |
|  | $a p . \gamma 4.3$ |  <br>  |  |
|  | a 5． 12 |  | a 2．9， 14 （bis）， 15 |
|  | － 2.12 | Tò 凶is éni tò $\pi 0 \lambda$ ú | 阝 25．8， 10 |
| ผิ้а | $\beta$ 16．I | Tà $\sigma v{ }^{\text {cheryùs．．．ws taưtà }}$ | a 9.28 |
| ${ }_{\text {w }}$ ¢at | $\beta$ 2． 11 | $\boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{( l o o s e l y ~ u s e d ) ~}$ | $\beta$ 22．16＊ |
| ävev кád入ous 凶ipaiols | $\boldsymbol{\gamma 4 . 3}$ |  | $\beta$ 23．14 ${ }^{\text {n }}$ ； |
| $\omega \rho^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.1$ |  | $\gamma 15.3{ }^{\text {n }}$ |

 

## SUPPLEMENTARY INDEX．

| fallacy of accident | $\beta 24.6$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| ＇accumulation＇（＇̇поккоסoкєîv） | $\alpha 7.31$ |
| accusative of＇local affection＇ |  |

a 13．10；$\beta 9.4$
action
Aeschines（ $\mu \omega \sigma \omega \mathrm{\sigma} \delta \mathrm{~s}$ ）
$\gamma 1.2^{n}, 3$
$\gamma 14.7$
Agathon or Theodectes（？）quoted $\boldsymbol{\beta} 23.1$ Albania
； 3.6
Alexander Aphrodisiensis
a 1.16 alibi

ק25．11
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 5.4$
$\beta 24.2$
fallacy of verbal ambiguity
$\beta 23.9$
＇amplification＇a．9．40；$\gamma$ 6． 1
topic of amplification and depreciation
F 19.26
argument from analogy $\beta$ 19．2；23．5， 17
Anaxandrides $\gamma 4.4$ ；10．7e；11．8；12．3 anger
$\beta 2$
antecedent and consequent $\beta 19.6$
Antisthenes $\quad \beta_{24 .}{ }^{2}$ p． $306 n^{1}$ ；$\gamma_{4.3}$
Antiphon＇s Meleager $\quad \beta$ 23． 5 （？）， 20
aorist and present infinitive $\quad \alpha 4.9$
Aristotle，
his brevity and obscurity，a 15.27 ；
$\beta$ 19．20，23；21． 11 ；23．20；$\gamma 1$ p． 1
exceptionally clear in $\quad \boldsymbol{\gamma} 10 \$ 8 \mathrm{I}-6$
carelessness of style a 6.24 （кal ol фav̂入ot）；$\beta 18$ init．
quotes memoriter $\quad \alpha 6.24 ; \beta$ 19．14；
21．2； $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.7$
misquotations $\gamma 4$. in $^{1}$ ；a 11．8；15． 13
references to his own works，

> èv rô̂s дıa入єктıкоîs
> a 2.8, 14
> a 2. 18
> - 24. 10


uses prep．with case instead of direct government of verb．
a 9． 14
triple division of＇goods＇（of mind，body and estate）
a 5.4
Aristotle＇s
Eth．Nicom．I I init．a 5．I
Eth．I 5 （def．of happiness）a 6.8
Eth．II 6 init．（def．of virtue compared with that in Rhet．）
a 9.4
Eth．II 7 （list of virtues，compared）
a 6．8；9．5
Eth．II 7 （ $\phi \theta$ óvos，$\nu \in \mu \in \sigma \iota s$, è $\pi \iota \chi \alpha \iota \rho \in к \alpha к l a)$ corrected

阝9．3－5＊
Eth．III 4 （ （0û̀ $\eta \sigma \iota$ ）
a 10.8
Eth．III 9 （ol $\theta a \lambda d \tilde{\tau} \tau \iota \circ$ ），inconsistency discussed
－5． 18
Eth．IV II init．（different treatment of траótทs）
； 3.3
Eth．IV 12 sub fin．（distinction between a $\rho \in \dot{\sigma} \sigma 0 s$ and $\kappa \delta \lambda a \xi$ disregarded in Rhet．）
$\beta 6.8$
Eth．v io（issue of fact）
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 17.2$
Eth，and Rhet．compared as to treat－
ment of＇pleasure＇
a 6.7
ditto as to view taken of the virtues
a 9． 10
a 5．I

Ar．Pol． 19 （on＇wealth＇，more exact than Rhet．）
a 5.7
Pol．II 7 （（д $\mu a \lambda_{\iota} \sigma \theta$ भival）
$\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ II． 5
Pol．II 9 （Spartan women）
a 5.6
Pol．II 12 （dvo $\mu \mathrm{d} \lambda \omega \sigma / s)$
$\gamma 11.5$

a 9．26， 27
Pol．IV（vil）16， 17 （prime of life）
$\beta 14.4$
Pol．vi（iv） 4 differs from Rhet．on the subjects of deliberation a 4.7
Pol．VII（vi） 4 （axt twos tbrov）a II． 16 account of constitutions in Pol．com－ pared with those in Rhet．a 8.4
the Politics compared with Adam Smith＇s Wealth of Nations a 5．7n
Aristotle＇s Ho入ıre：au
a4． 13 two rhetorical uses of the study of Politics
a 8．I
Aristotle＇s Poet．c． 4 8ss 1－5（on love of imitation）
a 11． 23
Aristotle＇s Topics，their relation to the Rhet．$\quad \alpha 7$ init．；$\beta 23$ p． 237 Problem xviII． 3 （examples and enthy－ memes）
a．2． 10
＇art＇independent of result a 1.14
 apud Platonem）ag．30 $\mathrm{n}^{1}$
generic use of article $\alpha 7.13 ; 12.5 ; 15.12$ ；
阝4．7；21．6
attraction of relative and antecedent
a 2．11；5． 11

auctoritas
a 2.3
audience，three kinds of
a 3.2
augment of verbs beginning with o－ $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{12} \mathbf{1 2 . 8}$
authority of distinguished men $\quad \boldsymbol{\beta} 25.7$
Babington，Professor Churchill $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.11 ; 8.6$
Bacon quoted

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { а 1. 14; 6. 18; 7.3; 4.31, 36; 15.12; } \\
& \text { } \beta \text { 1.9; 2. 1; 10. p. 122; 10. p. } 123 \text {; } \\
& \text { 12. p. 139; 13.4,7; } \\
& \gamma \text { 1.3,9; } 2.5 \\
& \text { Macaulay's Essay on Bacon as.10n } \\
& \text { Bain's Emotions and Will a 11.14; } \\
& \text { 阝1.8; 2.6; 5.1; 6.1; 8.2; 10. p. 122 } \\
& \text { benevolence, inclination to, } \quad \boldsymbol{\beta} 7 \\
& \text { general benevolence, of Christian origin } \\
& \text { } \beta 8.2 \\
& \text { Bentley's Phalaris } \\
& \text { - } 21.6
\end{aligned}
$$

Biblical quotations，
Genesis xxvii． $3^{6} \boldsymbol{\beta} \mathbf{2 3 . 2 9}$ ；Matt．xxiii． 35 a 14．6；Mark i．II（dyaxyrds） a 7． $41 \mathrm{n}^{1}$ ；ix． 41 （＇cup of water＇） a 5．9； 11 Ep．of St Peter ii． 14 $\beta$ 6．18；1 Ep．of St Fohn ii． 16阝6． 18 ；iv． 18 今 4.17
Blass quoted

Bonitz（index Aristotelicus，etc．）
а 7．16；$\beta$ 22．16；23．7，\＆c．
 25． 3 ；26． 5
bronze coinage $\gamma 2.11$
brutality a 14.5
Butler，Bishop，$\beta$ 59．3；quoted， 8.9 init．；
8．Ir init．
calumny
$\gamma 15.1$
causes of human action，seven in number，
a 10.7
the inference from cause to effect $\beta$ 23．25
change of choice，argument from $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{23} \mathbf{1 9}$
characteristics of youth，old age，and
prime of life $\quad \beta$ cc．12－14
children，blessing of a 5.6
Cicero
de inventione 118112
$\beta 7.2$
de Oratore Book 18 32 $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 11．5； $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 1． 9 n； \＄ 202 a I． 12
 168 $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 23．11； $172 \boldsymbol{\beta}$ 23．4； 178 $\beta$ 1．4； $186 \beta$ 21．15；219 $\beta$ 12．16； $254 \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 11．6； 255 $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 2．12； 284 r 11．6； 342 a 9．1； 348 a 9． 38 ； 321 and $323 \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 14． 7 ； 325 14．1； $336 \beta 19$ init．； $337 \gamma 12.1$ ； 342 a．9．I
Book III § $40 \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 5．1； $149 \boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.6$ ； $153 \boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.3$ ； 155 and $163 \gamma$ 2．12； 161 $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 2．13；175 $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 9.5$ ；207 a 7． 35；212 $\gamma$ 7．2；213 $\gamma 1.4$ ；216 $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.10$
Brutus 882 $\beta$ 21．10；§ $272 \boldsymbol{\beta}$ 21．7； § 258 f 5 ． I
Orator § $40 \boldsymbol{\beta}$ 21．7；44af．3； $55 \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ ． ． 4；70 $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.2$ 2；81 $\gamma 2.6$ ； 87 $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{12}$ ．16； $88 \gamma 18.7$ ； $117{ }^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ 23．7； $142 \boldsymbol{\beta}$ 23．3； 145 $\beta$ 19．12； $172 \boldsymbol{\gamma} 8$ ． 1 ； $175 \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 1．9； $178 \gamma 9.6 ; 189$ and $193 \gamma 8.4 ; 202$ $\gamma 2.3 ; 208 \gamma 12.2 ; 209$ and 220

| $\begin{aligned} & \gamma 8.1 \text {; } 210 \gamma 7.11 \text {; } 228 \gamma 8.2,6 \text {; } \\ & \text { and } 9.5 \end{aligned}$ |  $\beta \text { 23. } 18$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| pro Flacco § 9 \% 15.10. | Demosthenes (not the orator) $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 23.3; $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 4.3$ |
| pro Milone $8{ }^{22} \boldsymbol{\beta} \mathbf{2 3 . 2 5}$; 8 41 $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 23. 26 | demum a 1.7 |
| pro Murena $\gamma 18.7$; c. 39 § 83, a 6.19 | detailed description, amplification produced |
| citizenship, conditions of a 5.5 | by a 7.3 l |
| Cleon ${ }^{\text {r 8. }}$ I | Dickens $\quad \gamma 10 \mathrm{p} .110 \mathrm{n}^{\mathbf{1}}$; 17.16 |
| ax' a 7.31 | Dionysius of Halicarnassus, quotes Rhet. |
| , $\quad$ a $7.4 \mathrm{n}^{1}$ | $\beta$ 23.3; $\gamma 10.7$ |
| ion, fallacy | diminutive terminations $\quad \gamma 2.15$ |
| tive, double a $\quad$ 7. $8^{n} ; \beta 88$. | isions of the speech $\quad \gamma$ 13.1 |
| n of expression (substitution | 'division', argument from $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 23.10 |
| hor himself for character described by | Donaldson a 13.9; $\beta$ 9. 11 |
| m) $\beta^{3}$.17 | 'dropping' (a pitcher), no exact Greek |
| sion of two constructions $\quad \beta$ I. $\mathbf{I}$ | equivalent for a 6. 23 note. |
| $\beta 23$. | Dryden $\quad \beta$ 15.3; $\mathbf{\gamma 6 . 7}$ |
| ve particles $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 5$ | double readings $\boldsymbol{\beta} \mathbf{2 3 . 4}$ |
| estio $\beta$ 31. 10 |  |
| quence, fallacy of $\quad \beta$ 34.7 | ellipse of subjunctive of eveal (rare) $\boldsymbol{\beta} \mathbf{2 5 . 9}$ |
| quents, argument from $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{23.14,15}$ | ellipse of $\mu$ ôpav ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| from consequents to antecedents | emendations suggested $\beta_{1316} \mathbf{1 6} \boldsymbol{\gamma} 15.5$ |
| $\beta$ 23. 18 | emotion of power $a^{\boldsymbol{a}} 11.14$ |
| trary' defined $\gamma^{2}$ | emulation $\beta$ II init. |
| , arguments from $\beta$ 19. 1; 23.23 | end (to begin implies to end) $\quad \beta$ 19.5 |
| ries $\quad \gamma 9.8{ }^{\text {n }}$ | English diminutives $\gamma 2.15$ |
| $y$ instance' $\beta$ 25 | of enthymemes in general $\boldsymbol{\beta} \mathbf{2 2}$; cf. $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathbf{1 7 . 1 7}{ }^{\text {n }}$ |
| $\beta 4.23$ | on envy $\beta_{10}$ init. |
| courage ag.8 | Epicharmus $\quad$ a 7.31; $\beta$ 21. 6* |
| d' | epideictic branch of rhetoric, materials for |
| 23.21, 25 | a 9 |
| g instruments $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathbf{2 . 1 2}$ | episodes $\quad \gamma 17.11$ |
|  | epithets $\quad \boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.9$; 3.3 |
| oric (Schmidt etc.) | limiting epithets $\quad \boldsymbol{\gamma 6 . 7}$ |
| $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 20.3; 22.7, 10; 23.6 | equity a 13.13; 15. 10 |
| cult use of $\quad \beta \times 13$ | ethical character of the speech caused by |
| $\alpha 15.13$ |  |
| from decision already pronounced | euphemisms a 9.28,29 |
| $\beta$ 23. 12 | Euphron (Xen. Hell. viI 3) $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{23.3}$ |
| ctive verbs, кєîal ${ }_{\text {a }}$ | EUUIPIPES $\quad \gamma 14.6$; 15.8 |
|  | his answer to the Syracusans $\beta 6.20$ |
| tion, argument from $\quad \beta \mathbf{2 3 . 8}$ | his style $\quad \gamma$ 1.9 p. 12; 2.5 |
| degrees (three) in scale of moral nature |  |
| $\alpha 1$ |  |
| nch of Rhetoric, mater |  |
| cc. 6-8 | a 15.33" |
| delivery $\gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathbf{1 . 3}$ | $\beta$ 22. 3 |
| Demosthenes, his name only once mentioned in the Rhetoric <br> F 24.8 | Iphig. Aul. 80 $\boldsymbol{\gamma 1 1 . 2}$ <br> Iphig. Taur. $\mathbf{7 2 7}$ $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 6.4$ |
| mi. 85 7, $10 \quad \beta$ 23. 11 | 62 r ${ }^{\text {14.10 }}$ |
| Callicl. init. $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\text {21. }} 15^{\boldsymbol{n}}$ | 1186(E¢tvecras) a i. II |
|  | Medea 294-296 $\quad \beta$ 21.2, 6, 7 |

pro Flacco 8
pro Milone $8_{32} \beta_{23} 25 ; 8_{41} \beta_{23} 26$
pro Murena $\gamma 18.7$; c. 39 § 83, a 6. 19
citizenship, conditions of
Cleon
'climax'
$a 7.31$
'colours of good and evil' combination, fallacy of a 7. $18^{n}$; $\beta 8.4$ confusion of expression (substitution of author himself for character described by him) $\quad \beta 3.17$
confusion of two constructions
coniugata
connective particles
conquestio
consequence, fallacy of
-
consequents, argument from $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 23.14, 15
inference from consequents to antecedents
$\beta$ 23. 18
'contrary' defined $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.10$
contraries, arguments from $\beta$ 19. 1 ; 23.23 contraries
'contrary instance'

- 25.5

84. ${ }^{23}$
a 9.8
a 1.5
cui bono
cupping instruments
$\beta$ 20.3; 22.7, 10; 23.6
dive, difficult use of
$\beta$ 13. 16
dativus ethicus
a 15.13
inference from decision already pronounced

- 23.12
a 1.7
a 13.10
$\beta 23.8$
a 14.5
deliberative branch of Rhetoric, materials
$\gamma 1.3$
tioned in the Rhetoric $\quad \beta$ 34. 8
Dem. Boeot. de nom. 8S 7, $10 \quad \boldsymbol{\beta}$ 23. 11
Dem. Callicl. init. $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{21.15}{ }^{\boldsymbol{n}}$
Dem. Lept. §84 $\mathbf{8}_{4} \boldsymbol{\beta} \mathbf{2 3 . 6 n}$

Demosthenes (not the orator) $\boldsymbol{\beta} 23.3 ; \boldsymbol{\gamma 4 . 3}$ demum a 1.7 detailed description, amplification produced by ر 10 p. $110 \mathrm{n}^{1}$; 17.16 Dionysius of Halicarnassus, quotes Rhet.
diminutive terminations $\quad \gamma 2.15$
divisions of the speech $\quad \gamma \mathbf{1 3 . I}$
Division', argument from $\quad \boldsymbol{\beta}$ 23.10
'dropping' (a pitcher), no exact Greek
equivalent for a 6.23 note.
Dryden $\quad \beta$ i5.3; $\mathbf{\gamma} 6.7$
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 23.4$
ellipse of subjunctive of clual (rare) $\boldsymbol{\beta} \mathbf{2 5 . 9}$
ellipse of $\mu$ oîpav $\quad \beta 2.17$
emendations suggested $\beta_{13.16 ; ~}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma} 15.5}$ emotion of power $\alpha$ II. 14 emulation $\beta$ II init. end (to begin implies to end) $\quad \beta$ 19. 5
English diminutives $\gamma 2.15$
of enthymemes in general $\boldsymbol{\beta} \mathbf{2 2}$; cf. $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathbf{1 7 . 1 7 ^ { n }}$

epideictic branch of rhetoric, materials for
$\gamma 17.11$
epithets
$\gamma 6.7$
equity a 13.13 ; 15. 10 ethical character of the speech caused by
 euphemisms a 9.28,29 Euphron (Xen. Hell. viI 3) $\quad \boldsymbol{\beta} 23.3$ Euripipes $\gamma 14.6 ; \mathbf{1 5 . 8}$ his style $\quad \gamma$ 1.9 p. 12; 2.5 Eur. Androm. ( $\left.\dot{\eta} \delta \dot{v} \mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta \eta_{\eta} \theta a l \pi \delta \nu \omega \nu\right)$ a 11.8 Hec. 864 $\beta 21.2$
阝 22.3 Iphig. Aul. $80 \quad \boldsymbol{\gamma} 11.2$ Iphig. Taur. $727 \quad \gamma 6.4$

Medea 294-296 $\quad \beta$ 21. 2, 6, 7

Eur．Orest． 234
Troades 969
990
1051
Antiope
Meleager
Sthenelus
Telephus
Thyestes
Oeneus
exaggeration，fallacy of
＇example＇（тарdסecү $\mu a)$
eye，the seat of shame，love，\＆c．
a 11.20
$\gamma 17.15$
阝 23.29
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 21.5$ a 1 I． 28
$\gamma 9.4^{n}$
阝21．2
$\gamma$ 2． 10
$\beta 23.1$
$\gamma 16.7$
$\beta 24.4$
$\beta 20.2$
阝6． 18
fables
fact，topic of
$\beta 20.2$
$\beta$ 19． 16
fallacious inference of the audience $\quad \gamma 7.4$ fallacies，logical

F 24 P．301－3
fallacy from the omission of when and how
$\beta 24.9$
enumeration of rhetorical fallacies $\quad \boldsymbol{\beta}_{24}$
fallacies，verbal $\quad \beta 34 \mathrm{p}$ ． 301
on fear $\beta 5$
forensic branch of rhetoric
formal and material proofs
a fortiori
the Franks bad neighbours
friendship $\quad \alpha 5.16 ; \beta$ 4；12．3
Gaisford a 4．1；9．2（p．120n．）；12．30； $\beta 2.14 \mathrm{n}^{1}, \& \mathrm{c}$ ．
Garrick $\gamma 12.3$
gender，change of，in antecedent and rela－
tive al． 2
generalisation（illicit）$\quad \boldsymbol{\beta} 21.10$
genitive absolute
$\gamma 19.2$
genitive absolute for case after verb
今 8． 11 ； $23.3^{\circ}$
genitive case plural with $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ omitted，used
for the direct predicate in apposition to
the subject，e．g．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\eta} \dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \omega \nu(\tau l), \quad \alpha 11.4$
genuineness of the third book of the Rhet．
－ 26.5
genus and species
a 2.21
Goldsmith（＇talking age＇）
$\beta 13.12$
Gorgias，Elean Speech $\gamma$ 15．II；irony of， $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.11$ ；3．4；his metaphors，$\gamma \mathbf{3 . 4}$ ； Olympic speech， $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 14.2$ ；his poetic style， $\gamma$ 1．9；his sayings，$\gamma$ 3．4；17．11；18． 7 greater to less，argument from $\quad \boldsymbol{\beta} \mathbf{2 3 . 4}$

Hamilton，Sir William a 10.8
happiness，analysis of $\alpha 5$
Herodotus I I $\gamma$ 9．2；II 14I $\beta$ 24． 6 n．； III 14 ק 8.12
Herodotus and Sophocles $\quad \gamma \mathbf{1 6 . 9}$
high－mindedness a 9． 11
＇history＇a4．7，13
Hobbes $\quad \beta 4.3 \mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{1}}$ ；8．2； 10 p． 122
Homer，quoted or referred to，
Miad I I $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 14．6；82 $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{2.7} 7$ ；255 a 6．20；
356 2．6； $477 \boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.10$
II 160，176，a6．22； $196 \boldsymbol{\beta}$ 2．7；298 a6．22；
557 a 15．13；671，672， $673 \gamma 12.4$
IV 126
r 11.3
VI 484
a 11.12
IX 385，388， $390 \gamma$ 11．16； $522 \boldsymbol{\gamma 9 . 9}$ ； 588－590 a 7．31； $644 \beta 2.6$
XI 542－3 $\quad \gamma 9.11$ ； $573 \boldsymbol{\gamma 1 1 . 3}$
XII 243
$\beta^{212}$ ． 11
XIII 587， $799 \quad \gamma 11.3$
XV $542 \quad \gamma 113$
XVI $59 \quad \beta 2.6$
XVIII 98 a 3．6；109a11．9，$\beta$ 2．2；

XX 164，442， $445 \quad \gamma 4.1$
XXI $168 \quad \gamma 11.3$
XXIII 108 a． 11.13
XXIV $54 \quad \beta$ 3． 16
Odyssey
I i
$\gamma 14.6$
IV 204
$\gamma 17.6$
VI $327 \quad \gamma$ 14．II
IX $504 \quad \beta$ 3． 16
XI $597 \quad \gamma$ II． 3
XIV $26 \quad \beta$ 3．6； $214 \gamma$ io． 2
XV 399， 400 a． 11.8
XIX ${ }^{361} \quad \gamma$ 16．10
XXII 347
a 7.33
$\gamma 16.7$
Homer＇s metaphors $\gamma$ II． 3
Homer and the Chians $\quad \beta$ 23．1t
Salamis and Athens
a 15.13
Horace A．P． 156 seq．$\quad \beta 6.12$ ； 12 init． A．P． 169 seq．$\beta 13$ init．；$\beta$ 13． 6 ，
$7,8,9,15$
impersonal use of $\sigma$ ovveфєî et simı．$\quad \beta 19.24$ improbability，antecedent $\quad \beta \mathbf{2 3 . 2 2}$ incentives and deterrents，argument from considering
$\beta 23.21$
inconsistency between outward profession and real feeling，argument from，$\beta$ 23． 16 indignatio
of＇righteous indignation＇
$\beta$ 21． 10 B9 induction $\quad \beta$ 20．2；23．11 argument from similar inflexions $\quad \boldsymbol{\beta} \mathbf{2 3 . 2}$ intendere and remittere a4．12
interpolations $\quad a 15.26$
＇interrogation＇
$\gamma$ 18． 1
interrogatives without copula $\quad \boldsymbol{\beta} 21.15$
＇Introduction to Aristotle＇s Rhetoric＇cor－ rected a 1．10；15．8；$\beta$ 20．7； $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathbf{1 3 . 3}$
inventio a2．2
Iphicrates，on himself，a 7．32；9．31；on his son， $\boldsymbol{\beta} 23.17$ ；on Callias， $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.7$ ；on Chares，$\gamma$ 10．7；on Epidaurus， $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 10．7； on the Thebans and Philip，$\beta$ 23．6； Speech against Aristophon， $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 23．7； against Harmodius， $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 23．6，8；against Nausicrates，$\gamma 15.2$
irregularity of construction（superfluous oiv in resumption）
$\beta$ 9．II
Isocrates，
Aristotle＇s（supposed）ill－will towards a $9.3^{8} \mathrm{p} .186^{n} ; \gamma 16.4$
his＇philosophy＇$\quad \beta 20.7$ his withdrawal from practice in law－ courts
a $9.3^{8^{n}}$
his digressions $\quad \gamma 17.11$
$\pi e \rho l$ divtibfews（ 88 141－9）$\quad \gamma 17.16$
（88 217－220）$\beta 23.10^{n}$
Archidamus \＆ $50 \quad \gamma 17,17$
Evagoras $8^{8} 45 \quad$ a $9.3^{6}$ 8865－69 $\quad \beta$ 23．12；24．2
$\pi \rho d s$ Ezeúvour
Helen
de Pace
Panathenaicus § 32
Panegyricus
$\beta$ 19．14＂
$\gamma$ 14．1；$\beta$ 23． 12
$\gamma 17.10$
a $9.3^{6}$
Paneg．§s ${ }^{-1}$ ，35，41，48，72，89，105， 149， 181 and 186，all quoted in $\gamma 9.7$ ； Paneg． 8896 and 186 in $\gamma$ 7．11；14．2； 8 15I（тробкuvoûvtes）a 5．9n；\＆ 172 $\gamma$ 10． 7 ＂．
Philippus，884－7，23，72－78 in $\gamma 17$. 16＂${ }^{\text {；Phil．§ 61，}} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ II．7；§ 75，$\gamma$ 10．5； § $127, \gamma 11.2$

## iam

justice
fallacy of language
a 1.7
a 9． 7
F 24.2
relations of different kinds of law a 13 legal issues（ $\alpha \mu \phi \iota \sigma \beta \eta r \eta \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \iota s) \quad$ a 1．6；3．6； 13．9；$\gamma 16.6$
Lessing quoted $\boldsymbol{\beta} 8.1$ lexicographical notes
in Book a



 （verbs compounded with）13．9；Ėสเสо－
 2．12；グठ $\eta$ 1．7；lबтopla 4．8；Kúplos
 बтเầ 2．18；то入ıтıkஸ்тєроs 1．10；
 бvvd入入arرa ．．．$\sigma v \nu \theta \hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha a$ ．．．$\sigma v \mu \beta b \lambda a \iota a$ 1．10；4．11；Totoûtos（such as above described） 5.6
in Book $\beta$
 d $\psi$ lкopos 12.4 ；$\beta$ 人aifoots 23.15 ；$\beta$ oú－

 2．2；Opu入eî 21．11；кє申а入ls 19．10；

 15.3
in Book $\gamma$


liberality a 9.10
fondness of like for like a I1． 25
Lucretius I 716－733 $\quad \boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathbf{5 . 4}$
III 53 险 17.6
the ludicrous ail． 29
Lycophron $\quad \gamma 3.1 ; 9.7 ; 17.11^{\text {T }}$
Lysias $\quad \beta$ 23．6n．；23．19；$\gamma$ 19．1 ${ }^{n}$
Lysias contra Eratosth．ult．$\quad \gamma 19.6$
Orat．Funebr．$\quad \gamma 10.7^{n}$

| magnificence in expenditure | a 9.12 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Martial XII 51 | $\beta 12.7$ |
| on maxims | $\beta 21$ init． |
| memoria technica | $\beta 8.14 \mathrm{n}^{1}$ |
| metaphor from strings of the lyre | a4．12 |
| metaphors | 3； 10.7 |
| confusion of metaphor | $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.9{ }^{\text {n }}$ |
| J．S．Mill | $\boldsymbol{\gamma}{ }^{10.6}$ |
| argument from mistakes | $\beta 23.28$ |
| Montaigne quoted | $\boldsymbol{\beta} 2$. |


variation of negative，with no apparent difference of sense

阝 6.4
neuter article with collective abstract notion
neater dual with singular verb a 2.19
neuter plural with singular verb $\quad \beta 6.27$
characteristics of noble birth
$\beta \mathbf{1 5 . 2}$
＇odd，＇of striking excellence，
a 6． $28 \mathrm{n}^{1}$
characteristics of old age
omission of＇subject＇
arguments from opposites
$\beta$ 13．1－15
a 7.40
oracles
阝 23.1
r 5.4
＇parable＇
$\beta$ 20．4n
paradoxical declamations
parallelisms of expression
阝 24.6
parenthesis
$\gamma 9.9$
argument from parts to whole $\quad \beta$ 23．13 abnormal formation of the passive voice
a 12.22
Appendix（B）vol．I p．297； $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 3．7； $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathbf{1 . 3}$ ；
17.3
patience（xpabrvs）
perfect imperative passive
a 11.29
Pericles，funeral oration，a 7．34；$\gamma$ 10． 7 a； on Aegina $\gamma$ 10． $7 d$ ；on the Samians， and Boeotians $\gamma 4.3$ ；on Lampon， $\gamma$ 18．1；degeneracy of his family， $\beta 15.3$
the period and its construction $\quad \gamma 9$
peroration $\gamma 19$
physical theory of heat applied to human passions $\quad \boldsymbol{\beta}_{12}$ 2．pp．139， 145 ；13． 7

a 7.14
Isth．Iv（v） $20 \quad \gamma 17.11^{n}$
Ol．vi $13 \quad \beta$ i2．6

$$
\text { II } 82 \text { (I46) (Cycnus) }
$$

－22． 12
on pity
$\boldsymbol{\beta} 8$
Plato

> Apol. c. 15, 27 C $\quad \beta$ 23.8; $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \mathbf{1 8 . 2}$
> Euthyd. 274 е̇тєбкठтєє

Gorgias 463 е $\beta$ 23； 469 в а 7．22； 484 E \＆ 11.28
Menex． 235 D a 9．30； $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 14．11
Phacirus 231 D，241 E $\gamma$ 7． 11 ； 266 D $\gamma$ 13．5；267c（rшшиолоүіа）$\beta$ 21．1； $33^{8} \mathrm{D} \boldsymbol{\gamma} 7 \mathrm{II}$
Protagoras 339 B $\gamma 11.2$
Republic 469 D， 488 A， 601 в $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 4.3$
Aristippus on Plato $\quad \beta \mathbf{2 3 . 1 2}$ p． 265 on unpractical philosophers $\quad \boldsymbol{\beta} \mathbf{2 1 . 2}$
analysis of pleasure a II
pleasure of learning a 11．23；$\gamma$ 9．8
plural for singular $\quad \boldsymbol{\gamma} 6.4$
plural（esp．of proper names）used in gene－ ralised sense $\quad \beta 22.3$
Plutarch on characters of youth and old age
$\beta$ 12，pp． 139 and 145
＇posting＇defaulters $\quad \beta$ 23．25
encomiums on poverty $\quad \beta$ 24．6，7
characteristics of power $\quad \beta 17$
prepositions $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{k} x$－and $\sigma u v$－separable in sense
from verb with which they are com－
pounded
F 4.12
use of preposition with its case instead of
the direct government of the verb a 9.14 prime of life $\quad \beta \mathbf{1 4 . 4}$
the＇probable improbable＇$\quad \boldsymbol{\beta}$ 24． 10
arguments for probability of future events
$\beta 19.23$
on propriety of style $\quad \gamma$ 7．I
＇universal＇modes of rhetorical proof $\boldsymbol{\beta} \mathbf{2 0}$
the prophetic office $\quad \gamma 17.10$
Proverbs

|  | a 11.15 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | a 11.25 |
| ＇Atrıkds пípoukos | 阝21．12 |
|  | a 11.25 |
|  | 阝6． 18 |
|  | a 6． 22 |
|  | a II． 25 |
|  | $\beta 23.22$ |
|  | B6． 5 |
|  | $\boldsymbol{\gamma 1 1 . 1 4}$ |
| Kaúvos Épos | － 25.4 |
|  | －4．21； 10.6 |
| кowds＇Ephn̂s | $\beta 24.2$ |
|  | 15 |
| Mugûv 入ela | $a 12$. |



$$
\lambda \epsilon l \pi \in t \quad a \leq 15.14 ; \beta 21.11
$$


\％${ }^{12 .} 3$

| $\pi$ ávtuly пepl mávta a 9．4 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | a 12.23 |
|  | àvóñous a 6．20 |
| $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \epsilon \mu \phi \cup \lambda a$ ठeîraı ¢̇入alov | $\lambda a l o v \quad \beta$ 23．22 |
|  | тov̀s álas $\beta^{\mathbf{2} 23.15}$ |
|  |  |
|  | $\beta 10.5$ |
| Punch quoted | a 12． 19 |
| punctuation $\gamma$ | $\gamma 5.6 ; 8.6$ |
| puns $\quad \beta$ 23．29； | $\beta$ 23．29； $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 11.6$－8 |
| purity of language | \％5．${ }^{1}$ |
| Quintilian， |  |
| Institutio Oratoria II 17．27 1 \％1．5 |  |
| III 3．4 4 I．7；6． 26 ק 24．3；6． 34 |  |
| $\beta$ 23．21；7．25 a 9．28；7．23 a 9．30； |  |
| 8．8 8 14．1，12；8．22－26 $\beta$ 19 init．； |  |
| 8．62 $\gamma$ 12．5； $63 \boldsymbol{\gamma} 12.6 ; 9.4 \gamma 17.11$ ； |  |
| 9.5 人 13．3．4；$\gamma$ 17．14；9．28 a 9．35 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { IV 1. } 5,6,37 \gamma 14.7 ; 72 \gamma 14.8 ; 2.31 \\ & \gamma 16.4 ; 5.6 \beta 1.3 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| v proem．1 $\alpha$ 1．3；10．17 $\beta$ 12．1； 10. |  |
| $\boldsymbol{\beta} 23.13$ ；10． $73 \beta^{\prime} 23$ § I p．239， 23 § II； |  |
| 10． $74 \beta$ 23．14，29；10． $78 \beta$ 19．12； |  |
| $\beta$ 23． 3 ； $10.85 \beta$ 23．2；10．86－93 |  |
| $\beta$ 23． 4 ；10．94 $\beta^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ 23．p．238；12．8 |  |
| $\boldsymbol{\gamma 1 7 . 7 \% ~ 1 2 . 1 0 ~} \boldsymbol{\beta}^{1} 23.7$ |  |
| $3.29 \quad \gamma 2.13$ |  |
| VII $4.44 \beta^{24.3}$ |  |
|  |  |
| $\boldsymbol{\gamma 1 2 . 1 ; ~ 3 . ~} 37 \boldsymbol{\gamma} 7.9$ ；3．89 $\gamma 10.6$ ； |  |
| 5． $4 \beta_{21.2} \mathbf{2}$ 2．8 $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{21.9}$ |  |
| 1x $4.45 \quad \gamma 8$ ． 1 |  |
| 4． 124 Y 9．5 |  |
| XI 3.8 ¢ 12.2 |  |
| XII $52 \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{14.8}$ |  |

rectum．．．curvum（metaph．）
$\alpha 1.5$
argument from＇mutual relation of notions＇
$\boldsymbol{\beta}^{23}$ ． 3
retaliation
a 12.27 ；$\beta$ 5．8
retort
rhetorical artifices
$\boldsymbol{\beta}^{23} .7$
rhetorical definition of friendship a 5．16
rhetorical proofs，threefold division a 2.3
rhetoric，relation to dialectics a I．Ibc；
2． 7
rhetoric，triple division of
a． 3.1
rhythm in prose $\quad \gamma 8$
ridicule a If．29；$\gamma 18.7$
La Rochefoucauld $\beta 4.3$
John of Salisbury quoted a 1． 2 Greeks measured from the object seen，to themselves，a Ir．16；15．17
self－control a 9.9
universality of self－love a 11.26
sense－construction $\beta$ 5．13 $\mathrm{n}^{1}$
virtues of the number seven $\quad \beta$ I4． 4
Shakespeare，
Ant．and Cleop．II 5 $\beta$ 2．20；As you like it，II 7．143－166， $156 \beta$ 12 init．； 21． 9 ；Cymb．II 5．1 $\beta$ 21．10；Ham． 1 2． $146 \beta$ 21．10；III 1． 59 人 2． 9 ； Hen．IV．I 1． $84 \gamma$ 16．10；Hen．IV． p．II．I 1． 100 $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{2.20 ; \text { fohn } 11.187}$ $\beta$ 2．26；Fulius Caesar III 2 a 2．4； III 2．174 $\beta$ 8．16；III 2．221 $\gamma$ 3．4； IV 3．II6 $\beta$ 3． 5 ；Lear III $2.4 \gamma 3.1$ ； IV I． $3 \boldsymbol{\beta} 5.14$ ；V 3．230 $\beta$ 8．6；Mac－
 $\beta$ 4．9；v 8 19 $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 5．4；Merchant of Ven．IV 1． 209 a $12.3^{1}$ ；Merry Wives I 3.49 र 2．10；Mids．N．D．v 1.250 $\beta$ 4．9；Richard I1．I 3． 131 $\beta$ Io init．； II 1． $73 \boldsymbol{\beta}$ 23．29；Romeo and Fuliet， V 1． $68 \beta 5.14$ ；Tempest IV 1． 152 a 7 ． 31；Timon III 2． $49 \beta$ 6．7；Troilus and Cressida 1 3．241 $\beta$ 6．11．
Shakespeare＇s clowns $\beta 2$ I． 9 on shame $\beta 6$
Sir Philip Sidney at Zutphen a 5．9；7．32；$\beta 7.3$
fallacy from the＇sign＇$\quad \beta$ 34． 5
significant names $\quad \boldsymbol{\beta} 23.29$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { objection from similars } & \boldsymbol{\beta} \mathbf{2 5 . 6}\end{array}$
simile
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 4$
Simonides，on Corinth，a6．24；epigrams，
 answer to Hiero＇s wife，$\beta$ 16． 2 ；Olym． pic ode， $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 2． 14
＇size＇mentioned among personal advan－ tages $\quad \alpha 5.4$
Dr Smith＇s Biographical Dictionary，supple－ mented $\beta$ 12．14；23．11，22； $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ ． 1 I． 13
Adam Smith＇s Wealth of Nations compared with the Politics
a 5． 7 n．
＇social contract＇a 15.21
Socrates＇Apologia（Theodectes）$\beta 23.13$

Socrates，Archelaus $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 23．8；his family de－ generated，$\beta$ 15．3；the＇Socratic dia－ logues，$\gamma$ 16．8；Socr．and Meletus $\beta$ 23．13；$\gamma 18.2$
Socratic illustrations from mechanical arts
$\beta 20.4$
solution of rhetorical fallacies $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{25}$ init． sophistical answer $\gamma 18.4$ Sophocles，
 Soph．Ajax 114 （Hermann on）$\beta 10.2$ Soph．Antig． $223 \gamma$ 14．10； 450 seq．a 15．6； 456 a 13．2；688－700 $\gamma 17$ 16；912 $\gamma 16.9$ Oed．Tyr． 774
Teucer
$\gamma 14.6$
Tyro
$\beta$ 23．7；$\gamma 15.9$
Sophocles，the great storehouse of Greek idiom
$\beta$ 10． $2^{n}$
his sobriety of style
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.10$
Sophocles and Herodotus
$\gamma 16.9$
Sophocles（statesman and orator） a 14．3；$\gamma$ 15．3；18．6
degrees of sound r1．9；2．13
speech characteristic of man $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 1.9$
Spengel
a 1．12；2．6，8；
$\beta$ 1． 1 p．2；18 init．；18．4； 23 init．； 23． 3 p．244；23．4，15，18，20；26．5； 7 7．6；18．5， 6 \＆c．
Spenser
r 3.2
spes，sperare，（voces mediae）
squaring the circle
$\beta$ 8． 7
stock subjects of Athenian declaimers
阝 22.6
Stoics $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 8．2； $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ 10 p．122； $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ I1 init．； $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2.3$
Stasinus，Cypria $\quad a \mathbf{1 5}$ ．14； $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\text {21．} 11}$
style appropriate to the three branches of rhetoric
$\gamma$ 12． 1
substantive taking the case of its verb

$$
a 7 \cdot 32 ; \beta 4.3 \mathrm{n}^{1} ; 20.9
$$

removal of suspicion
阝 23.24
faults of taste
r3． 1
Theodectes，Ajax $\beta$ 23．20，24；on Socra－ tes $\beta$ 23．13，18．？；Alcmaeon $\beta$ 23．3；
 Theodorus（the rhetorician）


Theodorus（the actor）
.$\gamma 2.4$
Dr W．H．Thompson quoted
阝 23．9；Ү 3．1，4；17．11；18．7，\＆c．
Thrasymachus $\beta$ 21．10＂；23．29； Y 1．7；8．4；11． 13
consideration of time，argument from
$\beta 23.6$
Timotheus（the Dithyrambic poet）
$\boldsymbol{\gamma} 4.4$ ；IIIII
＇trade，＇Greek contempt for a 5．7 travels round the world a 4．13
＇two sides to every question＇$\quad \beta 8.4$
tyrants and body－guards a 2． 19
arguments from universal consent

$$
\beta 23.12 ; \text { p. } 264 \mathrm{n}^{1}
$$

Vahlen quoted $\alpha$ 13．2；
$\beta 18$ init．；18．2；22．16；24．2；25．3；26．5；
र 3．1， 3 ；7．10，\＆c．
valgus and varus $\beta 23.15$
velle － 23.7
via et ratione
a I． 2
Victorius（Vettori）a 7．10；
$\beta$ 9．4；21．13；23．18；
72．8；11．6．\＆c．
analysis of virtue and vice
a 9
vivacity of style $\gamma$ II init．
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Waller quoted } & \boldsymbol{\gamma} \text { I．} 9 \\ \text { characteristics of wealth } & \boldsymbol{\beta} \text { I．} 6\end{array}$
characteristics of wealth $\beta$ I． 6
Whately $\quad \dot{\gamma} 2.8 ; 11.3$
Whewell $\gamma 8$ ． 1
practical wisdom a 9.13
quick wit allied to madness $\quad \beta$ 15．3
wonder，the origin of learning $\alpha$ II．2I
different degrees of wrong－doing $\alpha 1 \mathrm{I} .21$ ；
12． 14 ；13．16；14．1；$\gamma 15.3$
characters of wrong－doers and their in－
tended victims
a 12
motives to wrong－doing a 10.5
Xenophanes $\quad a 15.29 ; \beta 23.18 ; 24.27$
Xenophon，Hellen．Iv $7 \beta$ 23． 12 ；Heller． VII $3 \boldsymbol{\beta}$ 23．3；（Ka入入las） $\boldsymbol{\gamma} 2$ ． 10
characteristics of youth $\beta$ 12．3－16
Zeno（？）a 12.10
zeugma
a 4.6 n ；9． $3^{8}$ p． 184
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[^0]:    1 Welcker, Nachtrag, p. 239, note 175, accuses Bentley of a 'wonderful blunder' in the interpretation of к䒑eiv in this passage, in saying, viz., that it signifies 'the first beginning of tragedy'-which it most undoubtedly does-and understands it himself of 'disturbing, altering', as кıшề vó $\mu$ ous (and the proverb
     He says that Bentley's rendering is längst widerlegt. [Bentley, On Phalaris, 1 pp. 284, 386, ed. Dyce, pp. 262, 309, ed. Wagner.]

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Schrader quotes Cis. Orator, c. 24 §81, Translation frequentissime servo ornis utitur, non modo urbanorum, sed etiam rusticorum, siquidem est corm gemmare vites, sitire agros, laetas esse segetes, luxuriosa frumenta.

    3 ' If the orator confines himself to these, his style may be novel and ornamental, yet without forcing itself unduly upon the attention, and perspicuous.' Paraphr. in Untrod.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1} \dot{v} \boldsymbol{j} \boldsymbol{\delta} \theta \in \sigma$ os, anything that is subjected as a foundation, a supposition or hypothesis, the basis of an argument, a first principle assumed, a theory, an underlying principle on which a scheme is to be built, the plot (ground plan) of a play, and so forth.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ Schrader quotes Cic. Orator, c. 24 §81, Translatione frequentissime sermo omnis utitur, non modo urbanorum, sed etiam rusticorum, siquidem est corum gemmare vites, sitire agros, laetas esse segetes, luxuriosa frumenta.

    2 'If the orator confines himself to these, his style may be novel and ornamental, yet without forcing itself unduly upon the attention, and perspicuous.' Paraphr. in Introd.

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ Aristotle writes raaduy Cicero, paean in the Orator, and paeon in the de Orators: Quintilian, paeon.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ This reminds us of Lord Lyndhurst's saying of Campbell's Lives of the

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ I may observe that this is one of the principal arts by which Mr Dickens attracts his readers, to which the remarkable vivacity of his writings is due.

[^7]:    ＇And that of Polyeuctus to one Speusippus who was paralysed，＂that he could not keep still（was as restless as ever），though bound（fettered， confined）by fate（or accident）in a pillory－（or stocks－）complaint＂［＂bound in a perfect pillory of pain＇］＇．

    Polyeuctus，probably of（the Ath．deme）Sphettus，an Attic orator， contemporary with Demosth．and of the same political party，viz．anti－ Maced nnian．See Plut．Vit．Demosth． 846 C，which connects him with Demosthenes．Also，Vit．Parallel．Demosth．c．io，í $\delta^{\prime}$ aùíòs фi入ó $\sigma$ oфos
    
     A short account of him is to be found in Smith＇s Biogr．Dict．s．v． No．2，（the writer says that＂the orations（！）of P．＂are here referred to）． There are six of the name mentioned in the Orators－Sauppe Index Nominum（ad Or．Att．）III 117．－It is uncertain whether the P．who appears in Dem．c．Mid．§ 139 is the same as he of Sphettus．Sauppe distinguishes them ：Buttmann，ad loc．Mid．560．2，has this note： ＂Orator temporis illius，praeter hanc Midiae defensionem，cum De－ mosthene coniunctissimus，si credimus Ruhnkenio，qui eundem putat ac Sphettium．Augerus non item；＂nor，apparently，Sauppe［nor Arnold Schaefer，Dem．u．s．Zeit，II．p．100，who elsewhere quotes Dem． Phil．III．§ 72，По入v́єukтos í $\beta$ é入тьбтоs ovitoбi（of the Sphettian）］．The speaker quoted by Ar．was doubtless the best known of them，the Sphettian．See the reff．in Westermann，Gesch．der Beredts．§ 53，5， 6.
    $\dot{a} \pi \pi \sigma \pi \eta^{\prime} \kappa \tau \iota \kappa o ́ s, ~ \dot{a} \pi o ́ \pi \lambda \eta \kappa \kappa \pi o s$, one who has received a shock or stroke （as of palsy），which has driven him away from（ $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{o}^{\prime}$ ）himself and his normal condition，and so disabled，paralysed，him：of an＇apoplectic stroke＇，but not here ；also，like ìk $\lambda^{\prime} \eta^{\prime} r \tau \epsilon \sigma \theta a$, to be startled out of one＇s wits，or driven mad，attonitus．I have followed Victorius in the in－ terpretation of the saying ；that Speusippus，though his body was now paralysed，and motionless as if he had been fastened in the stocks or pillory－or worse，in an instrument that confined his head，hands， and feet－had his mind as restless and excitable as ever．
    revtecópryyos is a transfer from a wooden instrument with five ＇pipes＇or holes，kept in the prison for the punishment of refractory prisoners，which confined at once the head，hands，and feet，to a disorder which paralyses and deprives of motion．Arist．Eq．1049，ठ $\bar{\eta} \sigma a i \sigma^{\circ}$
    
    
    
    
    
    
    
     various other punishments in use at Athens，see Becker＇s Charicles，

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ This speech is condemned as spurious by [Dobree and] Baiter and Sauppe [and also by Blass, die Attische Beredsamkeit, I p. 43 I, and Jebb, Attic Orators, I p. 208. It contains some close parallels to the Panegyric of Isocrates and would appear to have been written by one of the pupils of that rhetorician, from whom Ar. (it will be observed) takes the quotation just preceding the present passage]. Let us hear on the other side Mr Grote, Hist. Gr. vol. vi [chap. XlviII] p. 191, note, "Of (the funeral orations) ascribed to Plato and Lysias also, the genuineness has been suspected, though upon far less grounds (than that attributed to Demosth.)..... but this harangue of Lysias, a very fine composition, may well be his, and may perhaps have been really delivered-though probably not delivered by him, as he was not a qualified citizen." In this judgment I entirely agree; and it seems to derive some authority from the citation of this extract here, as a specimen of pointed style, which shews that it was at all events well known to Aristotle and the Athenian public, and well remembered, though the author's name is not given; perhaps for this very reason, that the authorship of it was so well known.

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ Diog. Laert., III 3. 24, says that Plato also was engaged in the defence of Chabrias, no one else daring to undertake it. See Grote's Plato, 1 128, note i.

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ What is learnt here is only that the man whom you expected (at the beginning of the sentence) to be an accomplished lawyer, turns out to be an empty coxcomb. It may be doubted again whether the knowlelge of that fact would give much pleasure.

[^11]:    
    

[^12]:    ${ }^{1}$ Vahlen, in Trans. Vien. Acad., u. s. pp. 146, 7. He also would connect the
     кal " ov่ $\boldsymbol{\delta \in \imath ̂ " ~ к . т . \lambda . ~}$

[^13]:    ${ }^{1}$ This comes most likely from Anaxandrides again (note on § 8). The verse
     ie. Meineke, Fr. Comic. Gr. III 20 I.

[^14]:    ${ }^{1}$ See on this，Mr Sandys＇Introduction to Isocratis Panegyricus，p．xl seq．

[^15]:    ${ }^{1}$ [So in Introd. p.325, after Victorius and Majoragius; but compare Mr Cope's second thoughts as given in the note on the same page: " $\epsilon v{ }^{v} \lambda e \chi \theta d v \tau e s$ can mean nothing but 'well spoken of', pr'ropes being understood."]

[^16]:    ${ }^{1}$ The ${ }^{t}$ pyov of a thing is always directed to its renos. If the end of a knife and of a horse be respectively to cut and to run, their tpyov will be fulfilled in sharpness and fleetness. So here the end of one of these compositions is to be read, its $\epsilon_{\rho}$ yov or appropriate function is exercised in reading, fulfilled in being pleasant to read.

[^17]:    ＇So the introductions of the epideictic speeches are derived from the following topics ；from praise，blame，exhortation，dissuasion，appeals to the hearer ：and these＂introductions＂＇（see the note on § I ：èvóocua is used here for $\pi \rho o o i \mu l a$ in general，instead of the more limited sense of the preceding passage）＇must be either foreign or closely connected with the speeches（to which they are prefixed）＇．

    छ́vos，a stranger or foreigner，is properly opposed to oikeios，domes－ ticus，one of one＇s own household．This last clause，$\delta \in i \quad \delta \epsilon ́$ к．r．入．is，as Vater remarks，introduced as a transition to the next topic，the forensic prooemia．
    § 5．＇The introduction of the forensic speech must be understood as having the same force（or value，or signification）as the prologue of a drama（rov，the drama to which it belongs），or the introduction to an epic poem：for to the epideictic exordia the preludes（introductions， avaßo入ai＇）of the dithyrambs bear resemblance，＂for thee and thy gifts， or spoils＂＇．On the avaßo ${ }^{2} a i$ ，the openings or introductions of dithyrambs， and their loose，incoherent，flighty character，see note on III 9．I．Introd． p．307，note I．It is this which makes them comparable to the epideictic exordia，as above described．

    The dramatic，i．e．tragic，prologue，and the introduction of the epic， are compared to the exordium of the dicastic speech，in that all three con－ tain＇statements of the case＇；the last，literally；the tragic and epic，vir－ tually．The prologue of Euripides（who of the three extant tragedians can be the only one whose prologues are referred to）actually states all the preceding circumstances of the story of the drama，which it is necessary that the spectator should be acquainted with in order to enter into the plot．The introduction of the Epic poem is neither so long nor so regular． That of the Iliad occupies only seven lines，and states the subject very， simply and in few words．That of the Odyssey is concluded in ten，and little or nothing of the story told．The Aeneid，and Pharsalia have seven apiece．
    § 6．Having hinted at the points of resemblance between the dithy－ rambic $\dot{a} \nu a \beta o \lambda a i$ and the epideictic prooemia，he now proceeds to explain further the resemblance of the dicastic proem to the prologue of tragedy and prelude of the Epic poem．
    ＇In the prose speeches as well as the poetry＇（Victorius understands

[^18]:    1 On＊this connexion，Victorius refers to Virg．Aen．viII 157，Nam memini Hesiones visentem regna sororis Laomedontiadem Priamum seq．；and Soph．Aj． 1299 seq．，where Teucer in answer to Agamemnon，boasting of his descent，says，
    
    

[^19]:    ${ }^{1}$ There is a temptation here to understand of $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda 0$ as 'the heroes of the declamation' ; 'those who have their actions narrated'- which is to be resisted. It is not true in this sense.

[^20]:    1 There is a doubtful story of a recitation at Olympia.

[^21]:    
    
    

[^22]:    ${ }^{1} \mathrm{kal}$ aitiay a reason in addition, besides the mere statement.

[^23]:    ${ }^{1}$ At this point the manuscript of Mr Cope's Commentary comes to an end; the rest of the notes have accordingly been supplied by Mr Sandys.

[^24]:    「 i．6，фартабia］Gataker ad Antonin．I§ 7，p． 8.
    2．3．ทो $\left.\pi \epsilon \rho^{i}\left[\lambda_{i ́ a \nu}\right] \mu \kappa \kappa \rho \omega \nu\right]$＇or if one speak about very trivial matters．＇

